arXiv:math/0504131v1 [math.AC] 7 Apr 2005

Inequalities satisfied by the basic sequence of an integral curve in $\mathbf{P}^3$

Mutsumi Amasaki

Graduate School of Education, Hiroshima University,
1-1-1 Kagamiyama, Higashi-Hiroshima 739-8524, Japan
E-mail : `amasaki@hiroshima-u.ac.jp`

February 8, 2005

Abstract

We show several new inequalities found recently that the basic sequence of the saturated homogeneous ideal I of an integral curve in $\mathbf{P}^3$ must satisfy. Then we compare our results with Cook's assertions on the generic initial ideal of I, carrying out numerical computations with the use of a computer. The outcome is that we have obtained new restrictions on the generic initial ideal of I. When $\mathrm{char}(k) = 0$, the basic sequence of a homogeneous ideal I in a polynomial ring over an infinite field k is a sequence of the degrees of the minimal generators of the generic initial ideal of I arranged in a suitable order.

Introduction

Let X be a curve in $\mathbf{P}^3 := \mathbf{P}^3_k$, namely, a locally Cohen-Macaulay equidimensional closed subscheme of $\mathbf{P}^3$ of dimension one, and let I denote the saturated homogeneous ideal of X in a polynomial ring $R := k[x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4]$, where k is an infinite field and the linear forms x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 are chosen sufficiently generally. Then there is what we call a Weierstrass basis $\{\ e^i_l \mid 1 \le i \le 3,\ 1 \le l \le m_i\ \}$ of I that is characterized by some properties connected with a representation of the multiplication of e^i_l by the linear forms x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 (see [7] and [8]). More precisely,

$$\begin{cases} I^{[1]} = I, \quad I^{[3]} = I^{\langle 3\rangle},\ I^{[i]} = I^{\langle i\rangle} \oplus I^{[i+1]}\ (i = 1,\ 2) \\ \text{as } k[x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_4]\text{-modules, and } x_i I^{[i+1]} \subset (x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_4) I'^{\langle i\rangle} \oplus I^{[i+1]}, \end{cases}$$

where $I^{[i]}$ is a finitely generated graded $k[x_i, \ldots, x_4]$-submodule of I and $I^{\langle i\rangle}$ (resp. $I'^{\langle i\rangle}$) is a finitely generated graded free $k[x_i, \ldots, x_4]$-submodule (resp. $k[x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_4]$-submodule) of I with free basis $\{\ e^i_l \mid 1 \le l \le m_i\ \}$ for each i $(1 \le i \le 3)$. We have $m_1 = 1$ and $\deg(e^1_1) = a = m_2$. Put $b := m_3$. Let $n_l := \deg(e^2_l)$ $(1 \le l \le a)$ and $n_{a+l} := \deg(e^3_l)$

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 14H50; Secondary 13P10, 13D02.

$(1 \leq l \leq b)$. We may assume that the sequence $n_1, \ldots, n_a$ (resp. $n_{a+1}, \ldots, n_{a+b}$) is nondecreasing after changing the order of $e^2_1, \ldots, e^2_a$ (resp. $e^3_1, \ldots, e^3_b$) if necessary. The sequence $B_R(I) := (a; n_1, \ldots, n_a; n_{a+1}, \ldots, n_{a+b})$ is determined uniquely by $X \subset \mathbf{P}^3$ and is called the basic sequence of I or X (see [2] and [6] – [8]). Note that X is projectively Cohen-Macaulay if and only if $b = 0$ (i.e. the subsequence $(n_{a+1}, \ldots, n_{a+b})$ is vacuous). In general, $a \leq n_1 \leq \cdots \leq n_a$ and $n_1 \leq n_{a+1} \leq \cdots \leq n_{a+b}$. There are a number of applications of basic sequence to the study of curves in $\mathbf{P}^3$ (see [1] – [5]).

In this paper, expanding the ideas in our earlier work [3, Section 1], we show several new inequalities that the components of $B_R(I)$ must satisfy when X is integral and $B_R(I)$ takes special forms (see Sections 5 and 6). Our main results are Theorem 5.7, Corollary 5.8, Propositions 5.11, 5.12, and Theorem 6.4. They can be summarized together with our related earlier results in the following manner.

Theorem. *Assume that X is contained in an irreducible surface of degree $a \geq 2$ and that $b \geq 1$. Let $n'_1, \ldots, n'_\omega$ $(\omega \geq 1)$ be a strictly increasing sequence of integers such that $\{n'_1, \ldots, n'_\omega\} = \{\ n_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq a\ \}$ and let $t_l := \#\{\ i \mid n_i = n'_l,\ 1 \leq i \leq a\ \}$. Then, the following inequalities hold, where an additional assumption* $\mathrm{char}(k) = 0$ *is needed in our proofs of* (ii) – (iv).

(i) *We have $n_i \leq n_{i+1} \leq n_i + 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq a-1$.*

(ii) *Suppose that $\omega > 1$. Let m be an integer with $1 \leq m < \omega$, $t := \sum_{l=1}^{m} t_l$, and a' be an integer with $t+1 \leq a' \leq a$. If $n_i = n_t + i - t$ for all $t \leq i \leq a'$ and $n_{a+1} < n_{a'}$, then $t(t-1)/2 > p$, where $p := \max\{\ i \mid n_{a+i} < n_{a'},\ 1 \leq i \leq b\ \}$.*

(iii) *Let a' be an integer with $2 \leq a' \leq a$. If $n_i = n_1 + i - 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq a'$, then $n_{a+1} \geq n_{a'}$.*

(iv) *Let a' be an integer with $3 \leq a' \leq a$. If $n_i = n_1 + i - 2$ for all $2 \leq i \leq a'$, then $n_{a+1} \geq n_{a'}$.*

(v) *If $n_i = n_1 + i - 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq a$, then $b > 2$ and $n_{a+j} \neq n_{a+1} + j - 1$ for some $1 \leq j \leq b$. If further there is an integer b_0 with $0 < b_0 < b$ such that $n_{a+b_0} + 1 < n_{a+b_0+1}$, then $b_0 > 2$ and $n_{a+j} \neq n_{a+1} + j - 1$ for some $1 \leq j \leq b_0$.*

(vi) *Suppose that $b = 1$ and that X does not contain any line as an irreducible component. Delete the terms $n'_2, \ldots, n'_\omega$ from the sequence $(a, n_1, \ldots, n_a, n_{a+1})$ and then rearrange the remaining terms so that they make a nondecreasing sequence. Let $(n''_1, \ldots, n''_{a+3-\omega})$ denote the resulting sequence. Then*

$$n_{a+1} \leq a - 2 + \sum_{j=1}^{a} n_j - \sum_{\gamma=2}^{\omega} n'_\gamma - \sum_{i=1}^{a-\omega} n''_i.$$

Let us explain the motivation of our study in this paper. For a sequence $Bseq = (a; n_1, \ldots, n_a; n_{a+1}, \ldots, n_{a+b})$ satisfying $0 < a \leq n_1 \leq \cdots \leq n_a$ and $n_1 \leq n_{a+1} \leq \cdots \leq n_{a+b}$ with $b \geq 0$, put

$$D(Bseq) := \sum_{l=1}^{a} n_l - \frac{1}{2}a(a-1) - b,$$

$$G(Bseq) := 1 + \sum_{l=1}^{a} \frac{1}{2} n_l(n_l - 3) - \sum_{l=1}^{b} n_{a+l} + b - \frac{1}{6} a(a-1)(a-5).$$

Denoting the degree and the arithmetic genus of X by $d(X)$ and $g(X)$ respectively, we have $d(X) = D(B_R(I))$ and $g(X) = G(B_R(I))$ (see [2, Remark 1.9]). With this in mind, we are interested in the following problem. *For each pair of nonnegative integers* d, g, *give a good characterization of a sequence* $Bseq = (a; n_1, \ldots, n_a; n_{a+1}, \ldots, n_{a+b})$ *for which there is an integral curve* X *in* $\mathbf{P}^3$ *such that* $Bseq = B_R(I)$, $d = D(B_R(I))$, *and* $g = G(B_R(I))$. The case $b = 0$ was settled a long time ago in [13]. But we do not have any complete general answer to this problem as yet.

When $\mathrm{char}(k) = 0$, the reduced Gröbner basis of I with respect to the reverse lexicographic order becomes a Weierstrass basis of I such that $\mathrm{in}^x(e_1^1) = x_1^a$, $\mathrm{in}^x(e_l^2) = x_1^{a-l} x_2^{\beta_{a-l}}$ $(1 \le l \le a)$, $\mathrm{in}^x(e_l^3) = x_1^{t_l} x_2^{u_l} x_3^{\beta_{t_l u_l}}$ $(1 \le l \le b)$, where $1 \le \beta_{a-1} < \beta_{a-2} < \cdots < \beta_0$ and $t_l < a$, $u_l < \beta_{t_l}$, $\beta_{t_l u_l} > 0$ (see [2], [6] and [8]). Note that $n_l = a - l + \beta_{a-l}$ $(1 \le l \le a)$, $n_{a+l} = t_l + u_l + \beta_{t_l u_l}$ $(1 \le l \le b)$. One may therefore expect to see some relation between our results and the main assertions in Cook's paper [11], though it is pointed out that there is an error in the proof of the main theorem of [11] (see [12, Section 4]). There is however no more than one result apparently common to both, namely, the inequalities $n_i \le n_{i+1} \le n_i + 1$ for all $1 \le i \le a - 1$ (see [3, Corollary 1.2] or Lemma 2.4). In order to compare our results with Cook's main assertions, we have carried out numerical computations with the use of a computer which show us sequences $(a; n_1, \ldots, n_a; n_{a+1}, \ldots, n_{a+b})$ satisfying the conditions stated in this paper and the sequences coming from the generic initial ideals satisfying the assertions in Cook's paper. The outcome is that neither implies the other in general. By the same computations we can observe that, in a certain narrow range of the pairs of degree and genus, our results in this paper seem effective for the classification of integral curves in $\mathbf{P}^3$ (see Section 7).

As in our previous papers, our arguments depend heavily on the knowledge of the relation matrices λ_2 and λ_3 appearing in the standard free resolution which starts with $e_1^1, e_1^2, \ldots, e_a^2, e_1^3, \ldots, e_b^3$ (see [1], [6]).

In Section 1, basic knowledge of Weierstrass bases and standard free resolutios are summarized. In Section 2, new technical results on λ_2 which play an inportant role in the proof of our main theorem are given. We have also included some of the points, seen in [3, Section 1] and necessary for our purposes, in a more adaptable form for the convenience of the readers. In Sections 3 and 4 the properties of the matrix λ_3 are studied for the purpose of analyzing the structure of $\mathrm{Ext}_R^3(R/I, R)$ as $k[x_3, x_4]$-module. In Sections 5 and 6, our main results are given with full use of the results of the previous sections. Finally in Section 7, comparison of our results and Cook's main assertions are carried out briefly with numerical cmputations.

Notation

(i) Given a set of polynomials, say Z, we denote by $\mathrm{MAT}(Z)$ the set of matrices with entries in Z.

(ii) The symbol $\oplus$ will be used in the following two senses:

(a) $E' \oplus E'' = \{\ (e', e'') \mid e' \in E',\ e'' \in E''\ \}$,
(b) $E' \subset E,\ E'' \subset E,\ E' \cap E'' = 0,\ E' \oplus E'' = \{\ e' + e'' \mid e' \in E',\ e'' \in E''\ \} \subset E$.
Usually the context will make it clear which it means. But when direct sums in both meanings appear in a single formula simultaneously, we will use another symbol $\oplus\!\!\!\!\cdot\;$ instead of $\oplus$ to express the direct sum in the first sense.

(iii) Given a graded module $E = \bigoplus_t [E]_t$, integers p, q $(q \geq 0)$ and a sequence of integers $\bar{d} = (d_1, \ldots, d_n)$, we set $-\bar{d} := (-d_1, \ldots, -d_n)$, $\bar{d} + p := (d_1 + p, \ldots, d_n + p)$, and $E(\bar{d}) := \bigoplus_{l=1}^{n} E(d_l)$ (in the sense (a)), where $[E(d_l)]_t := [E]_{d_l + t}$.

(iv) Let $F = (f_{ij})$ be a matrix whose entries are homogeneous polynomials and $\Delta = (d_{ij})$ be a matrix of integer coefficients of the same size as F. We write $\mathit{\Delta}(F) = \Delta$ to mean that $\deg(f_{ij}) = d_{ij}$ for all i, j such that $f_{ij} \neq 0$.

(v) For a matrix $\Delta = (d_{ij})$ with entries in $\mathbf{Z}$ and an integer n, we denote by $\Delta + n$ the matrix $(d_{ij} + n)$.

(vi) For an integer n, we denote by 1_n the $n \times n$ unit matrix.

(vii) Let F be an $m \times n$ matrix in a commutative ring R and P be a subring of R. The image of the linear map from P^n to R^m over P defined by multiplication by F will be denoted by $\mathrm{Im}^P(F)$.

(viii) Let F be a matrix, and $s_1, \ldots, s_p$ and $t_1, \ldots, t_q$ be strictly increasing sequences of integers. We denote by $F\left({s_1, \ldots, s_p \atop t_1, \ldots, t_q}\right)$ the matrix obtained from F by deleting its s_i-th rows $(1 \leq i \leq p)$ and t_j-th columns $(1 \leq j \leq q)$.

§1. Weierstrass bases and standard free resolutions of homogeneous ideals defining curves in $\mathbf{P}^3$

We summarize here some properties of Weierstrass bases and free resolutions of homogeneous ideals defining curves in $\mathbf{P}^3$ which are necessary to prove our main theorems, along with elementary results and arguments from [1] – [3] and [6] – [8] for the convenience of the readers.

Let y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4 be indeterminates over an infinite field k, R the polynomial ring $k[y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4]$, $\mathfrak{m}$ the maximal ideal (y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4), γ_{ij} $(1 \leq i \leq 4,\ 1 \leq j \leq 4)$ elements of k such that the matrix $\mathit{\Gamma} := (\gamma_{ij})$ is invertible, and x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 elements of R satisfying $y_i = \sum_{j=1}^{4} \gamma_{ji} x_j$ $(1 \leq i \leq 4)$.

Let I be a homogeneous ideal in R of height 2 such that $\mathrm{depth}_{\mathfrak{m}}(R/I) \geq 1$. Then, for a sufficiently general choice of $\mathit{\Gamma}$, there are finitely generated graded $k[x_i, \ldots, x_4]$-submodules $I^{[i]} \subset I$ $(1 \leq i \leq 3)$ and finitely generated graded free $k[x_i, \ldots, x_4]$-submodules $I^{\langle i \rangle} \subset I$ $(1 \leq i \leq 3)$ such that

$$\begin{cases} I^{[1]} = I, \quad I^{[3]} = I^{\langle 3 \rangle},\ I^{[i]} = I^{\langle i \rangle} \oplus I^{[i+1]}\ (i = 1,\ 2) \\ \text{as } k[x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_4]\text{-modules, and } x_i I^{[i+1]} \subset (x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_4) I^{\langle i \rangle} \oplus I^{[i+1]} \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

by the results of [7, Section 2]. For each $1 \leq i \leq 3$, let $\{\ e_l^i \mid 1 \leq l \leq m_i\ \}$ be a free basis of $I^{\langle i \rangle}$ and $a := \min\{\ l \mid [I]_l \neq 0\ \}$. Since $\mathrm{rank}_R(I) = 1$ and $\dim(R/I) = 2$, we have $m_1 = 1$

and $\deg(e^1_1) = a = m_2$. Put $b := m_3$, $n_l := \deg(e^2_l)$ $(1 \leq l \leq a)$, $n_{a+l} := \deg(e^3_l)$ $(1 \leq l \leq b)$. We may assume that the sequence $n_1, \ldots, n_a$ (resp. $n_{a+1}, \ldots, n_{a+b}$) is nondecreasing after changing the order of $e^2_1, \ldots, e^2_a$ (resp. $e^3_1, \ldots, e^3_b$) if necessary. When the matrix Γ is chosen sufficiently generally, the sequence $B_R(I) := (a; n_1, \ldots, n_a; n_{a+1}, \ldots, n_{a+b})$ is determinned uniquely by I not depending on Γ, and is called the basic sequence of I (see [7, Definition 2.13], [6, Definition (1.5)], [2, Definition 1.4]). It is also called the basic sequence of $\operatorname{Proj}(R/I)$. Note that $a \leq n_1$. Recall further that $b = 0$ if and only if $\operatorname{depth}_{\mathfrak{m}}(R/I) = 2$ and that $a \leq n_1 \leq n_{a+1}$ when $b > 0$ (see [6, Theorem (1.1) and Proposition (1.6)]). By (1), we have

$$I = Re^1_1 \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{l=1}^{a} k[x_2, x_3, x_4] e^2_l \right) \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{l=1}^{b} k[x_3, x_4] e^3_l \right) \tag{2}$$

as $k[x_3, x_4]$-module. If the system of generators $\{e^1_1, e^2_1, \ldots, e^2_a, e^3_1, \ldots, e^3_b\}$ mentioned above satisfies the additional conditions

$$\begin{cases} x_1 e^2_{l'} \in (x_2, x_3, x_4) k[x_2, x_3, x_4] e^1_1 \oplus \left(\displaystyle\bigoplus_{l=1}^{a} k[x_2, x_3, x_4] e^2_l \right) \\ \qquad\qquad \oplus \left(\displaystyle\bigoplus_{l=1}^{b} k[x_3, x_4] e^3_l \right) \quad \text{for} \quad 1 \leq l' \leq a, \\ x_1 e^3_{l'} \in (x_3, x_4) k[z_2, z_3, z_4] e^1_1 \oplus (x_3, x_4) \left(\displaystyle\bigoplus_{l=1}^{a} k[x_2, x_3, x_4] e^2_l \right) \\ \qquad\qquad \oplus \left(\displaystyle\bigoplus_{l=1}^{b} k[x_3, x_4] e^3_l \right) \quad \text{for} \quad 1 \leq l' \leq b, \\ x_2 e^3_{l'} \in (x_3, x_4) \left(\displaystyle\bigoplus_{l=1}^{a} k[x_3, x_4] e^2_l \right) \oplus \left(\displaystyle\bigoplus_{l=1}^{b} k[x_3, x_4] e^3_l \right) \quad \text{for} \quad 1 \leq l' \leq b, \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

then we call it a Weierstrass basis of I with respect to x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4. One can always find a Weierstrass basis of I (see [7, Theorem 2.12], [8, Theorem 2.5], [6, Theorem (1.1)]).

Remark 1.1. Let Γ be sufficiently general and let $\operatorname{in}^x(I)$ be the ideal in R generated by the monomials

$$\{ \operatorname{in}^x(f) \mid f \text{ is a homogeneous polynomial of } I \}$$

in x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, where $\operatorname{in}^x(f)$ denotes the initial term of f with respect to the reverse lexicographic order associated with the variables x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4. It is often called the generic initial ideal of I. In the case where $\operatorname{char}(k) = 0$, we can obtain a Weierstrass basis $\{e^1_1, e^2_1, \ldots, e^2_a, e^3_1, \ldots, e^3_b\}$ of I with respect to x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 practically by taking the reduced and minimal Gröbner basis of I with respect to the order mentioned above in such a way that

$$\operatorname{in}^x(e^1_1) = x_1^a, \quad \operatorname{in}^x(e^2_l) = x_1^{a-l} x_2^{\beta_{a-l}} \ (1 \leq l \leq a),$$

$$\operatorname{in}^x(e^3_l) = x_1^{t_l} x_2^{u_l} x_3^{\beta_{t_l u_l}} \ (1 \leq l \leq b),$$

where $1 \leq \beta_{a-1} < \beta_{a-2} < \cdots < \beta_0$, $t_l < a$, $u_l < \beta_{t_l}$, $\beta_{t_l u_l} > 0$ for $1 \leq l \leq b$, and $(t_l, u_l) \neq (t_{l'}, u_{l'})$ for l, l' with $l \neq l'$, by strong Borel fixedness. See [6, Theorem (1.1), Lemma (4.4) and Proposition (4.5)] or [8, Proposition 1.5 and Theorem 2.5] for the detail. Then $\mathrm{in}^x(I)$ is minimally generated by $x_1^a, x_1^{a-1}x_2^{\beta_{a-1}}, \ldots, x_1 x_2^{\beta_1}, x_2^{\beta_0}$ and $x_1^{t_l}x_2^{u_l}x_3^{\beta_{t_l u_l}}$ $(1 \leq l \leq b)$. We have $a = \deg(x_1^a)$, $n_l^2 = \deg(x_1^{a-l}x_2^{\beta_{a-l}})$ $(1 \leq l \leq a)$, and $n_l^3 = \deg(x_1^{t_l}x_2^{u_l}x_3^{\beta_{t_l u_l}})$ $(1 \leq l \leq b)$.

Lemma 1.2. *Let I, R and x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 be at the beginning of this section, and let $\{e_1^1, e_1^2, \ldots, e_a^2, e_1^3, \ldots, e_b^3\}$ be a Weierstrass basis of I with respect to x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4.*

(i) *Let p be an integer with $1 \leq p \leq a$ and*

$$h \in \left(\bigoplus_{1 \leq l \leq a,\ l \neq p} k[x_3, x_4] e_l^2 \right) \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{l=1}^{b} k[x_3, x_4] e_l^3 \right)$$

a homogeneous element such that $\deg(e_p^2) = \deg(h)$. Put $e'^2_p := e_p^2 + h$. Then, we obtain another Weierstrass basis $\{e_1^1, e_1^2, \ldots, e_{p-1}^2, e'^2_p, e_{p+1}^2, \ldots, e_a^2, e_1^3, \ldots, e_b^3\}$ of I with respect to x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4.

(ii) *Let p be an integers with $1 \leq p \leq a$ such that $\deg(e_1^1) = \deg(e_p^2)$ and c an element of k. Put $e'^1_1 := e_1^1 + c e_p^2$. Then, the system of generators $\{e'^1_1, e_1^2, \ldots, e_a^2, e_1^3, \ldots, e_b^3\}$ is another Weierstrass basis of I with respect to x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4.*

(iii) *Let p be an integers with $1 \leq p \leq a$ and c an element of k^*. Put $e'^2_p := c e_p^2$. Then, the system of generators $\{e_1^1, e_1^2, \ldots, e_{p-1}^2, e'^2_p, e_{p+1}^2, \ldots, e_a^2, e_1^3, \ldots, e_b^3\}$ is also a Weierstrass basis of I with respect to x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4.*

(iv) *Let p, q be an integers with $1 \leq p < q \leq a$ such that $\deg(e_p^2) = \deg(e_q^2)$. Put $e'^2_p := e_q^2$, $e'^2_q := e_p^2$. Then, exchanging e_p^2 and e_q^2, we obtain another Weierstrass basis $\{e_1^1, e_1^2, \ldots, e_{p-1}^2, e'^2_p, e_{p+1}^2, \ldots, e_{q-1}^2, e'^2_q, e_{q+1}^2, \ldots, e_a^2, e_1^3, \ldots, e_b^3\}$ of I with respect to x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4.*

(v) *Let p, q be an integers with $1 \leq p < q \leq a$ such that $\deg(e_l^2) = \deg(e_p^2)$ for all $p \leq l \leq q$, and let $G \in GL(q-p+1, k)$. Put $(e'^2_p, \ldots, e'^2_q) := (e_p^2, \ldots, e_q^2)G$. Then, we obtain another Weierstrass basis $\{e_1^1, e_1^2, \ldots, e_{p-1}^2, e'^2_p, \ldots, e'^2_q, e_{q+1}^2, \ldots, e_a^2, e_1^3, \ldots, e_b^3\}$ of I with respect to x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4.*

Proof. Recall that homogeneous elements $e_1^1, e_1^2, \ldots, e_a^2, e_1^3, \ldots, e_b^3$ of I form a Weierstrass basis of I with respect to x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 if and only if all of the conditons (2) and (3) hold. To prove (i), put $e'^1_1 := e_1^1$, $e'^2_p := e_p^2 + h$, $e'^2_l := e_l^2$ $(l \neq p,\ 1 \leq l \leq a)$, $e'^3_l := e_l^3$ $(1 \leq l \leq b)$ and let

$$J^{[3]} := \sum_{l=1}^{b} k[x_3, x_4] e'^3_l, \quad J^{[2]} := \sum_{l=1}^{a} k[x_2, x_3, x_4] e'^2_l + J^{[3]},$$

$$J^{[1]} := R e'^1_1 + J^{[2]}.$$

We first show that $J^{[1]}$ is an ideal in R. Let l' be an arbitrary integer with $1 \le l' \le b$. Since $\{e_1^1, e_1^2, \ldots, e_a^2, e_1^3, \ldots, e_b^3\}$ is a Weierstrass basis, we have

$$\begin{aligned} x_2 e'^3_{l'} = x_2 e^3_{l'} &= \sum_{l=1}^{a} g_l^2 e_l^2 + \sum_{l=1}^{b} g_l^3 e_l^3 \\ &= -g_p^2 h + \sum_{l=1}^{p-1} g_l^2 e_l^2 + g_p^2 e'^2_p + \sum_{l=p+1}^{a} g_l^2 e_l^2 + \sum_{l=1}^{b} g_l^3 e_l^3 \end{aligned}$$

with suitable $g_l^2 \in (x_3, x_4)k[x_3, x_4]$ $(1 \le l \le a)$ and $g_l^3 \in k[x_3, x_4]$ $(1 \le l \le b)$ by (3). Since $h \in \left(\bigoplus_{1 \le l \le a,\ l \ne p} k[x_3, x_4] e_l^2\right) \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{l=1}^{b} k[x_3, x_4] e_l^3\right)$, this implies that

$$x_2 e'^3_{l'} \in (x_3, x_4) \left(\sum_{l=1}^{a} k[x_3, x_4] e'^2_l\right) + \sum_{l=1}^{b} k[x_3, x_4] e'^3_l \subset J^{[2]}. \tag{4}$$

Using this repeatedly, we see also that

$$x_2^t e'^3_{l'} \in (x_3, x_4) \left(\sum_{l=1}^{a} k[x_2, x_3, x_4] e'^2_l\right) + \sum_{l=1}^{b} k[x_3, x_4] e'^3_l \subset J^{[2]}. \tag{5}$$

for all $t \ge 1$. Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 e'^3_{l'} = x_1 e^3_{l'} &= g_1^1 e_1^1 + \sum_{l=1}^{a} g_l^2 e_l^2 + \sum_{l=1}^{b} g_l^3 e_l^3 \\ &= -g_p^2 h + g_1^1 e_1^1 + \sum_{l=1}^{p-1} g_l^2 e_l^2 + g_p^2 e'^2_p + \sum_{l=p+1}^{a} g_l^2 e_l^2 + \sum_{l=1}^{b} g_l^3 e_l^3 \end{aligned}$$

with suitable $g_1^1,\ g_l^2 \in (x_3, x_4)k[x_2, x_3, x_4]$ $(1 \le l \le a)$ and $g_l^3 \in k[x_3, x_4]$ $(1 \le l \le b)$ by (3), so that

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 e'^3_{l'} &\in (x_3, x_4) \left(k[x_2, x_3, x_4] e'^1_1 + \sum_{l=1}^{a} k[x_2, x_3, x_4] e'^2_l\right) + \sum_{l=1}^{b} k[x_2, x_3, x_4] e'^3_l \\ &\subset (x_3, x_4) \left(k[x_2, x_3, x_4] e'^1_1 + \sum_{l=1}^{a} k[x_2, x_3, x_4] e'^2_l\right) + \sum_{l=1}^{b} k[x_3, x_4] e'^3_l \\ &\subset J^{[1]} \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

by (5). For each l' $(1 \le l' \le a)$,

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 e'^2_{l'} &= g_1^1 e_1^1 + \sum_{l=1}^{a} g_l^2 e_l^2 + \sum_{l=1}^{b} g_l^3 e_l^3 \\ &= -g_p^2 h + g_1^1 e_1^1 + \sum_{l=1}^{p-1} g_l^2 e_l^2 + g_p^2 e'^2_p + \sum_{l=p+1}^{a} g_l^2 e_l^2 + \sum_{l=1}^{b} g_l^3 e_l^3 \end{aligned}$$

with suitable $g_1^1 \in (x_2, x_3, x_4)k[x_2, x_3, x_4]$, $g_l^2 \in k[x_2, x_3, x_4]$ $(1 \leq l \leq a)$ and $g_l^3 \in k[x_3, x_4]$ $(1 \leq l \leq b)$ again by (3), whether $l' = p$ or not. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 e'^2_{l'} &\in (x_2, x_3, x_4)k[x_2, x_3, x_4]e'^1_1 + \sum_{l=1}^{a} k[x_2, x_3, x_4]e'^2_l + \sum_{l=1}^{b} k[x_3, x_4]e'^3_l \\ &\subset J^{[1]} \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

by (5). Now, we find by [7, Lemma 2.7] that $J^{[1]}$ is an ideal in R, since we have verified (4), (6) and (7). Moreover, it is clear that the subideal $J^{[1]}$ contains the generators $e_1^1, e_1^2, \ldots, e_a^2, e_1^3, \ldots, e_b^3$ of I. Hence $J^{[1]} = I$. Since $\deg(e'^i_l) = \deg(e^i_l)$ for all i, l, we find by counting $\dim_k([I]_t)$ $(t \in \mathbf{Z})$ with the use of (2) and

$$I = J^{[1]} = Re'^1_1 + \sum_{l=1}^{a} k[x_2, x_3, x_4]e'^2_l + \sum_{l=1}^{b} k[x_3, x_4]e'^3_l$$

that the above expression must be a direct sum as $k[x_3, x_4]$-module. Then, the conditions (4), (6) and (7) imply that $\{e'^1_1, e'^2_1, \ldots, e'^2_a, e'^3_1, \ldots, e'^3_b\}$ satisfies (3) with e^i_l replaced by e'^i_l. Thus $\{e'^1_1, e'^2_1, \ldots, e'^2_a, e'^3_1, \ldots, e'^3_b\}$ is a Weierstrass basis of I with respect to x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4. This proves (i). One can prove (ii) in the same manner. The assertions (iii) and (iv) are trivial. Since an element of $GL(q-p+1, k)$ is a product of elementary matrices and a diagonal one, we obtain (v) by (i) and (iii). ☐

Let us recall the standard free resolution of I starting with a Weierstrass basis $\{e_1^1, e_1^2, \ldots, e_a^2, e_1^3, \ldots, e_b^3\}$. For each triple i, i', l with $1 \leq i < i' \leq 3,\ 1 \leq l' \leq m_{i'}$ $(m_2 = a,\ m_3 = b)$, we have

$$x_i e^{i'}_{l'} = g_1^1 e_1^1 + \sum_{l=1}^{a} g_l^2 e_l^2 + \sum_{l=1}^{b} g_l^3 e_l^3 \tag{8}$$

by (2), where $g_1^1 \in R,\ g_l^2 \in k[x_2, x_3, x_4],\ g_l^3 \in k[x_3, x_4]$. Put

$$\lambda_1 := (e_1^1, e_1^2, \ldots, e_a^2, e_1^3, \ldots, e_b^3). \tag{9}$$

Since (3) also holds, there are matirces with homogeneous components

$$\begin{cases} U_{01} \in \mathrm{MAT}((x_2, x_3, x_4)k[x_2, x_3, x_4]),\ \mathring{U}_1 \in \mathrm{MAT}(k[x_2, x_3, x_4]), \\ U_{02},\ U_2 \in \mathrm{MAT}((x_3, x_4)k[x_2, x_3, x_4]), \\ U_{21}, \mathring{U}_3, \mathring{U}_5 \in \mathrm{MAT}(k[x_3, x_4]),\ U_4 \in \mathrm{MAT}((x_3, x_4)k[x_3, x_4]) \end{cases} \tag{10}$$

such that

$$\begin{cases} (e_1^2, \ldots, e_a^2)x_1 1_a = \lambda_1 \begin{bmatrix} -U_{01} \\ \mathring{U}_1 \\ -U_{21} \end{bmatrix}, \\ (e_1^3, \ldots, e_b^3)x_1 1_b = \lambda_1 \begin{bmatrix} -U_{02} \\ -U_2 \\ \mathring{U}_3 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (e_1^3, \ldots, e_b^3)x_2 1_b = \lambda_1 \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -U_4 \\ \mathring{U}_5 \end{bmatrix}. \end{cases} \tag{11}$$

Let

$$\begin{cases} U_1 := x_1 1_a - \mathring{U}_1, \quad U_3 := x_1 1_b - \mathring{U}_3, \quad U_5 := x_2 1_b - \mathring{U}_5, \\ \lambda_2 := \begin{bmatrix} U_{01} & U_{02} & 0 \\ U_1 & U_2 & U_4 \\ U_{21} & U_3 & U_5 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \lambda_3 := \begin{bmatrix} -U_4 \\ -U_5 \\ U_3 \end{bmatrix}. \end{cases} \tag{12}$$

Then

$$U_1 - x_1 1_a \in \mathrm{MAT}(k[x_2, x_3, x_4]), \quad U_3 - x_1 1_b,\ U_5 - x_2 1_b \in \mathrm{MAT}(k[x_3, x_4]) \tag{13}$$

by (10) and

$$\lambda_1 \lambda_2 = 0$$

by (11). Furthermore,

$$\lambda_2 \lambda_3 = 0$$

and the sequence

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \longrightarrow R(-\bar{\tau} - 2) \xrightarrow{\lambda_3} & R(-\bar{\sigma} - 1, -\bar{\tau} - 1, -\bar{\tau} - 1) \\ & \xrightarrow{\lambda_2} R(-a, -\bar{\sigma}, -\bar{\tau}) \xrightarrow{\lambda_1} I \longrightarrow 0 \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

is exact by [1, Example 2.8] or [6, (3) of Corollary (3.11)], where $\bar{\sigma} := (n_1, \ldots, n_a)$, $\bar{\tau} := (n_{a+1}, \ldots, n_{a+b})$. The relation $\lambda_2 \lambda_3 = 0$ embraces a lot of informations on the structure of $\mathrm{Ext}^3_R(R/I, R)$.

Lemma 1.3. *Let I be a homogeneous ideal in R of height 2 such that $\mathrm{depth}_{\mathfrak{m}}(R/I) \geq 1$, $x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 \in [R]_1$ linear forms, $\{e^1_1, e^2_1, \ldots, e^2_a, e^3_1, \ldots, e^3_b\}$ a Weierstrass basis of I with respect to x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4. Let further λ_2, λ_3, U_i $(1 \leq i \leq 5)$, U_{01}, U_{02}, U_{21} be matrices as in (10) – (12). Then*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{Ext}^3_R(R/I, R) \cong \mathrm{Coker}^R({}^tU_3, {}^tU_5, {}^tU_4) \\ & \cong \left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^{b} k[x_3, x_4](n_{a+i} + 2) \right) / \left(\sum_{\rho=0}^{b-1} \mathrm{Im}^{k[x_3,x_4]}(({}^t\mathring{U}_5)^\rho \cdot {}^tU_4) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the second isomorphism stands for an isomorphism over $k[x_3, x_4]$. Moreover, $x_1 v \in (x_3, x_4)\,\mathrm{Im}^R({}^tU_3, {}^tU_5) + \mathrm{Im}^{k[x_2,x_3,x_4]}({}^tU_4)$ for all columns v of ${}^tU_4$.

Proof. One can find a proof of the major part in [2, pp. 802–803]. But, for the convenience of the readers, we reproduce a proof here. Now, let us consider $\mathrm{Im}^R({}^tU_3, {}^tU_5, {}^tU_4)$. Forgetting degrees, we have

$$R^{a+2b} = \mathrm{Im}^R \left(\begin{bmatrix} -{}^tU_5 & -{}^tU_4 \\ {}^tU_3 & {}^tU_2 \\ {}^tU_{21} & {}^tU_1 \end{bmatrix} \right) \oplus \left(R^b \oplus k[x_2, x_3, x_4]^{a+b} \right).$$

by [7, Lemma 1.1] and

$$({}^tU_3, {}^tU_5, {}^tU_4) \begin{bmatrix} -{}^tU_5 & -{}^tU_4 \\ {}^tU_3 & {}^tU_2 \\ {}^tU_{21} & {}^tU_1 \end{bmatrix} = 0$$

by the relation $\lambda_2\lambda_3 = 0$, so that

$$\mathrm{Im}^R({}^tU_3, {}^tU_5, {}^tU_4) = \mathrm{Im}^R({}^tU_3) \oplus \mathrm{Im}^{k[x_2,x_3,x_4]}({}^tU_5, {}^tU_4)$$

as $k[x_2, x_3, x_4]$-module. At the same time, since $-{}^tU_3{}^tU_4 + {}^tU_5{}^tU_2 + x_1{}^tU_4 - {}^tU_4{}^t\mathring{U}_1 = 0$, one finds that each column of $x_1{}^tU_4$ lies in $(x_3, x_4)\,\mathrm{Im}^R({}^tU_3, {}^tU_5) + \mathrm{Im}^{k[x_2,x_3,x_4]}({}^tU_4)$ by (10). This proves the last assertion. Since

$$\begin{aligned} x_2^\nu \cdot v &= {}^tU_5 \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\nu} x_2^{\nu-i} ({}^t\mathring{U}_5)^{i-1} \right) v + ({}^t\mathring{U}_5)^\nu \cdot v \\ &\in \mathrm{Im}^{k[x_2,x_3,x_4]}({}^tU_5) \oplus \sum_{\rho \geq 0} \mathrm{Im}^{k[x_3,x_4]}(({}^t\mathring{U}_5)^\rho({}^tU_4)), \end{aligned}$$

for all $\nu \in \mathbf{Z}$ and for each column v of ${}^tU_4$, we see that

$$\mathrm{Im}^{k[x_2,x_3,x_4]}({}^tU_5, {}^tU_4) = \mathrm{Im}^{k[x_2,x_3,x_4]}({}^tU_5) \oplus \sum_{\rho \geq 0} \mathrm{Im}^{k[x_3,x_4]}(({}^t\mathring{U}_5)^\rho({}^tU_4))$$

as $k[x_3, x_4]$-module. Moreover

$$\sum_{\rho \geq 0} \mathrm{Im}^{k[x_3,x_4]}(({}^t\mathring{U}_5)^\rho({}^tU_4)) = \sum_{\rho=0}^{b-1} \mathrm{Im}^{k[x_3,x_4]}(({}^t\mathring{U}_5)^\rho({}^tU_4))$$

by Hamilton-Cayley's theorem. On the other hand,

$$R^b = \mathrm{Im}^R({}^tU_3) \oplus \mathrm{Im}^{k[x_2,x_3,x_4]}({}^tU_5) \oplus k[x_3, x_4]^b$$

as $k[x_3, x_4]$-module. Hence

$$\mathrm{Coker}^R({}^tU_3, {}^tU_5, {}^tU_4) \cong k[x_3, x_4]^b / \left(\sum_{\rho=0}^{b-1} \mathrm{Im}^{k[x_3,x_4]}(({}^t\mathring{U}_5)^\rho \cdot {}^tU_4) \right)$$

as $k[x_3, x_4]$-module. Since $\mathrm{Ext}^3_R(R/I, R) \cong \mathrm{Coker}^R({}^tU_3, {}^tU_5, {}^tU_4)$ by the free resolution (14), we get our first assertion, taking the degrees into account. □

Lemma 1.4. *Let $I = (f, g)$ be a homogeneous ideal in R generated by homogeneous polynomials f, g of degree p, q respectively. Suppose that $p \leq q$ and that f, g form an R-regular sequence. Then the basic sequence of I is $(p; q, q+1, \ldots, q+p-1)$.*

Proof. Let $\{e_1^1, e_1^2, \ldots, e_a^2, e_1^3, \ldots, e_b^3\}$ be a Weierstrass basis of I, λ_2 tha matrix as in (12), and $(a; n_1, \ldots, n_a; n_{a+1}, \ldots, n_{a+b})$ the basic sequence of I. It is clear that $a = p$. Since R/I is Cohen-Macaulay, we have $b = 0$. Hence

$$\lambda_2 = \begin{bmatrix} U_{01} \\ U_1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since I is minimally generated over R by two elements, the rank of the relation matrix $\lambda_2 \pmod{(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)}$ must be $a-1$. On the other hand $U_{01} \equiv 0 \pmod{(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)}$ by (10), so that the rank of $U_1 \pmod{(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)}$ must be $a - 1$. Since $n_1, \ldots, n_a$ is a nondecreasing sequence, this is possible only when $n_l = n_1 + l - 1$ for all $1 \leq l \leq a$, considering the degrees of the components of U_1 (cf. (8), (12)). Moreover,

$$\operatorname{rank}_k \left(U_1 \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \end{pmatrix} \pmod{(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)} \right) = a - 1$$

in this case. Hence $I = (e_1^1, e_1^2)$. From this it follows that $q = \deg(e_1^2) = n_1$. This proves our assertion. $\square$

§2. Properties of U_{01} and U_1

Let I be a homogeneous ideal in $R = k[y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4]$ of height 2 such that $\operatorname{depth}_{\mathfrak{m}}(R/I) \geq 1$ and let $B_R(I) = (a; n_1, \ldots, n_a; n_{a+1}, \ldots, n_{a+b})$ be its basic sequence. It was proved for the first time in [14, Corollaire 2.2] that $n_1, \ldots, n_a$ is connected (i.e. $n_i \leq n_{i+1} \leq n_i + 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq a - 1$) if I is prime and $b = 0$. Later, the same result was proved without the assumption that $b = 0$ in [3, Corollary 1.2]. In recent papers [11] and [12], enhanced assertions similar to the above connectedness are given for the case $\operatorname{char}(k) = 0$, considering the generic initial ideal of I. But there seems to be some gaps in the proofs given there. Along the same line of argument as that of [3], we gave a proof of the connectedness asserted by Cook for a special case in [9]. In this section, we first give a brief but a little bit closer account of our method to prove the connectedness of $n_1, \ldots, n_a$. Developing our argument further, we next show some crucial properties of U_{01} and U_1 needed to prove our main theorems, when there is an irreducible homogeneous polynomial of degree a in I.

Let ζ_{ij} $(1 \leq i \leq 4,\ 1 \leq j \leq 4)$ be indeterminates over R, K the quotient field of the polynomial ring $k[\zeta] := k[\zeta_{ij}; 1 \leq i \leq 4,\ 1 \leq j \leq 4]$, z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4 elements of $R_K := K[y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4]$ such that $y_i = \sum_{j=1}^4 \zeta_{ji} z_j$ $(1 \leq i \leq 4)$, and $I_K := IR_K$. Then, there is a Weierstrass basis $\{\tilde{e}_1^1, \tilde{e}_1^2, \ldots, \tilde{e}_a^2, \tilde{e}_1^3, \ldots, \tilde{e}_b^3\}$ of I_K with respect to z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4, since $\operatorname{depth}_{\mathfrak{m}R_K}(R_K/I_K) \geq 1$ (see [7, Theorem 2.12], [8, Theorem 2.5]). The homogeneous polynomials $\tilde{e}_l^i$ $(1 \leq i \leq 3,\ 1 \leq l \leq m_i) \in R_K$ satisfy (1) – (3) with $I,\ x_i,\ k,\ e_l^i$ replaced by $I_K,\ z_i,\ K,\ \tilde{e}_l^i$ respectively. By exactly the same method as in the previous section, one obtains matrices

$$\lambda_1 := (\tilde{e}_1^1, \tilde{e}_1^2, \ldots, \tilde{e}_a^2, \tilde{e}_1^3, \ldots, \tilde{e}_b^3), \quad \tilde{\lambda}_2 := \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{U}_{01} & \tilde{U}_{02} & 0 \\ \tilde{U}_1 & \tilde{U}_2 & \tilde{U}_4 \\ \tilde{U}_{21} & \tilde{U}_3 & \tilde{U}_5 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \tilde{\lambda}_3 := \begin{bmatrix} -\tilde{U}_4 \\ -\tilde{U}_5 \\ \tilde{U}_3 \end{bmatrix}$$

which give a free resolution

$$\begin{aligned}0 \longrightarrow R_K(-\bar{\tau}-2) \xrightarrow{\tilde{\lambda}_3} & R_K(-\bar{\sigma}-1,-\bar{\tau}-1,-\bar{\tau}-1) \\ & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\lambda}_2} R_K(-a,-\bar{\sigma},-\bar{\tau}) \xrightarrow{\tilde{\lambda}_1} I_K \longrightarrow 0.\end{aligned}$$

Note that these matrices satisfy the conditions corresponding to (10) and (13) with $x_i,\ k$ replaced by $z_i,\ K$.

Remark 2.1. The results on Weierstrass bases described in Section 1 are all valid for $\{\tilde{e}^1_1, \tilde{e}^2_1, \ldots, \tilde{e}^2_a, \tilde{e}^3_1, \ldots, \tilde{e}^3_b\}$, since it is a Weierstrass basis in any case.

Assume that the matrix $\Gamma = (\gamma_{ij})$ mentioned at the beginning of Section 1 is sufficiently general. For each pair i, l, let e^i_l denote the polynomial obtained from $\tilde{e}^i_l$ by the substitution $(\zeta_{ij}) = \Gamma$. Then $\{e^1_1, e^2_1, \ldots, e^2_a, e^3_1, \ldots, e^3_b\}$ is a Weierstrass basis of I with respect to x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 (see the proof of [7, Theorem 2.12]). In this case, the matirices $\lambda_2,\ \lambda_3,\ U_i\ (1 \le i \le 5),\ U_{01},\ U_{02}$ and U_{21} described in Section 1 are also obtained from $\tilde{\lambda}_2,\ \tilde{\lambda}_3,\ \tilde{U}_i\ (1 \le i \le 5),\ \tilde{U}_{01},\ \tilde{U}_{02}$ and $\tilde{U}_{21}$ respectively by the same substitution.

Lemma 2.2. *With the notation above, suppose that there is an irreducible homogeneous polynomial of degree a in I. Denote by $\check{e}^i_l,\ \check{U}_{01},\ \check{U}_1$ and so on the polynomials and the matrices obtained from $\tilde{e}^i_l,\ \tilde{U}_{01},\ \tilde{U}_1$ and so on by the substitution $z_3 = z_4 = 0$. Suppose there is an integer s' $(0 < s' < a)$ such that*

$$\begin{bmatrix}\check{U}_{01}\\ \check{U}_1\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}\check{D}_{11} & \check{D}_{12}\\ 0 & \check{D}_{22}\end{bmatrix}$$

with an $(s'+1) \times s'$ matrix $\check{D}_{11}$, an $(s'+1) \times s''$ matrix $\check{D}_{12}$ and an $s'' \times s''$ matrix $\check{D}_{22}$, where $s'' = a - s'$. Then $n_{s'+1} = a$.

Proof. Since $\tilde{U}_{02},\ \tilde{U}_2 \in \mathrm{MAT}((z_3, z_4)K[z_2, z_3, z_4])$ by the condition corresponding to (10), it follows from the relation $\tilde{\lambda}_1\tilde{\lambda}_2 = 0$ that $(\check{e}^3_1, \ldots, \check{e}^3_b)\check{U}_3 = 0$. This implies that $\check{e}^3_l = 0$ for all $1 \le l \le b$. Hence

$$(\check{e}^1_1, \check{e}^2_1, \ldots, \check{e}^2_a)\begin{bmatrix}\check{U}_{01}\\ \check{U}_1\end{bmatrix} = 0$$

again by the relation $\tilde{\lambda}_1\tilde{\lambda}_2 = 0$. Let $\check{I}_K := (\check{e}^1_1, \check{e}^2_1, \ldots, \check{e}^2_a)K[z_1, z_2] \subset K[z_1, z_2]$. Then $R_K/I_K + (z_3, z_4)R_K = K[z_1, z_2]/\check{I}_K$ and this ring must be of finite length over K. By Hilbert-Burch theorem,

$$\check{e}^1_1 = \det\left(\check{U}_1\right), \quad \check{e}^2_i = (-1)^i \det\left(\begin{bmatrix}\check{U}_{01}\\ \check{U}_1\end{bmatrix}\binom{i+1}{}\right) \quad (1 \le i \le a)$$

up to constant multiplication. Since there is an irreducible homogeneous polynomial of degree a in I by hypothesis, $\check{I}_K$ also contains an irreducible homogeneous polynomial of degree a, say $\check{e}$, by Lemma 2.3 below. Let $i_0 := 0$ if $n_1 > a$ and $i_0 := \max\{\ i \mid n_i = a,\ 1 \le i \le a\ \}$ otherwise. We have $\check{e} = \check{c}_0\check{e}^1_1 + \sum_{i=1}^{i_0}\check{c}_i\check{e}^2_i$ with $\check{c}_0, \check{c}_i \in K$, where we understand $\sum_{i=1}^{i_0}\check{c}_i\check{e}^2_i = 0$ if $i_0 = 0$. If $n_{s'+1} > a$, then $i_0 \le s'$, so that the above formula implies thta $\check{e}$ must be divisible by $\det(\check{D}_{22})$, which is a contradiction. Hence $n_{s'+1} = a$. In consequence, $a = n_1 = \cdots = n_{s'+1}$. □

Lemma 2.3. *Let* $f(y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4)$ *be an irreducible homogeneous polynomial in* R. *Then*

$$\hat{f} := f(\zeta_{11}z_1 + \zeta_{21}z_2, \zeta_{12}z_1 + \zeta_{22}z_2, \zeta_{13}z_1 + \zeta_{23}z_2, \zeta_{14}z_1 + \zeta_{24}z_2)$$

is irreducible in $k[\zeta][z_1, z_2]$.

Proof. Suppose to the contrary and let $\hat{f}_1,\ \hat{f}_2 \in k[\zeta][z_1, z_2]$ be polynomials of positive degree such that

$$\hat{f} = \hat{f}_1\hat{f}_2. \tag{15}$$

Since $\hat{f}$ is homogeneous of degree $\deg(f)$ in ζ_{ij} $(1 \le i \le 4,\ 1 \le j \le 4)$ and in z_1, z_2, we see that $\hat{f}_1$ and $\hat{f}_2$ are also homogeneous in ζ_{ij} $(1 \le i \le 4,\ 1 \le j \le 4)$ and in z_1, z_2. Let δ_1 (resp. δ_2) be the degree of $\hat{f}_1$ (resp. $\hat{f}_2$) in z_1, z_2. Consider the equality (15) in $k[\zeta][z_1, z_2]_{z_1}$. Since $\zeta_{1i} + \zeta_{2i}(z_2/z_1)$ $(1 \le i \le 4)$ and ζ_{ji} $(1 \le i \le 4,\ 2 \le j \le 4)$ are algebraically independent over $k[z_1, z_2]_{z_1}$, and since

$$\hat{f} = z_1^{\deg(f)} f(\zeta_{11} + \zeta_{21}(z_2/z_1), \zeta_{12} + \zeta_{22}(z_2/z_1), \zeta_{13} + \zeta_{23}(z_2/z_1), \zeta_{14} + \zeta_{24}(z_2/z_1)),$$

we see that $\hat{f}_1$ or $\hat{f}_2$ must be a unit in $k[\zeta][z_1, z_2]_{z_1}$ by the irreducibility of f. We may assume without any loss of generality that $\hat{f}_1 = c_1 z_1^{\delta_1}$ $(c_1 \in k)$. Likewise, considering (15) in $k[\zeta][z_1, z_2]_{z_2}$, we find that $\hat{f}_1$ or $\hat{f}_2$ must be a unit in $k[\zeta][z_1, z_2]_{z_2}$. In consequence, $\hat{f}_2 = c_2 z_2^{\delta_2}$ $(c_2 \in k)$. Thus, $\hat{f}$ is of degree zero in ζ_{ij} $(1 \le i \le 4,\ 1 \le j \le 4)$, which is absurd. □

With the notation above, let $n'_1, \dots, n'_\omega$ $(\omega \ge 1)$ be a strictly increasing sequence of integers such that $\{n'_1, \dots, n'_\omega\} = \{\ n_i \mid 1 \le i \le a\ \}$ and let $t_l := \#\{\ i \mid n_i = n'_l,\ 1 \le i \le a\ \}$. When $\omega > 1$, we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{U}_{01} \\ \tilde{U}_1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} * & * & \cdots\cdots & & * \\ \tilde{D}_1 & * & \cdots\cdots & & * \\ \tilde{C}_1 & \tilde{D}_2 & * & \cdots & * \\ 0 & \tilde{C}_2 & \tilde{D}_3 & * & * \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & * \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & \tilde{C}_{\omega-1} & \tilde{D}_\omega \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\tilde{C}_l$ is a $t_{l+1} \times t_l$ matrix whose entries are homogeneous of degree $n'_l + 1 - n'_{l+1} \le 0$ for each $1 \le l < \omega$ and $\tilde{D}_l$ is a $t_l \times t_l$ matrix whose entries are linear forms in z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4 over K for each $1 \le l \le \omega$.

Lemma 2.4. *Let the notation be as above. Suppose that there is an irreducible homogeneous polynomial of degree* a *in* I. *Then,* $n_i \le n_{i+1} \le n_i + 1$ *for all* $1 \le i \le a - 1$. *If further* $\omega > 1$, *then* $\tilde{C}_l \ne 0$ *for all* $1 \le l < \omega$.

Proof. When $\omega = 1$, our assertion is trivial. Assume $\omega > 1$. Suppose $\tilde{C}_{\omega_0} = 0$ for some $1 \leq \omega_0 < \omega$. Then

$$\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{U}_{01} \\ \tilde{U}_1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{D}_{11} & \tilde{D}_{12} \\ 0 & \tilde{D}_{22} \end{bmatrix}$$

with an $(s'+1) \times s'$ matrix $\tilde{D}_{11}$, an $(s'+1) \times s''$ matrix $\tilde{D}_{12}$ and an $s'' \times s''$ matrix $\tilde{D}_{22}$, where $s' = \sum_{l=1}^{\omega_0} t_l > 0$, $s'' = a - s' > 0$. Denote by $\check{U}_{02},\ \check{U}_1,\ \check{D}_{ij}$ the matrices obtained from $\tilde{U}_{02},\ \tilde{U}_1,\ \tilde{D}_{ij}$ respectively by the substitution $z_3 = z_4 = 0$. Then,

$$\begin{bmatrix} \check{U}_{01} \\ \check{U}_1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \check{D}_{11} & \check{D}_{12} \\ 0 & \check{D}_{22} \end{bmatrix}.$$

But $n_{s'+1} = n'_{\omega_0+1} > a$ by our choice of ω_0 and s'. This contradicts Lemma 2.2. Thus we have shown that $\tilde{C}_l \neq 0$ for all $1 \leq l < \omega$. In consequence, $n'_{l+1} = n'_l + 1$ for all $1 \leq l < \omega$ and $\tilde{C}_l$ is a matrix in K different from zero. Hence, $n_i \leq n_{i+1} \leq n_i + 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq a-1$. $\square$

Lemma 2.5. *Let the notation and the assumption be the same as in Lemma 2.4. Suppose $\omega > 1$ and let m be an ingeger with $1 \leq m < \omega$. Then, there is a $\tilde{G}_m \in GL(t_m, K)$ such that*

$$\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{G}_m^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 1_{t_{m+1}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{D}_m \\ \tilde{C}_m \end{bmatrix} \tilde{G}_m = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{D}'_m & \tilde{D}''_m \\ 0 & \tilde{C}''_m \end{bmatrix},$$
$$(\tilde{D}'_m, \tilde{D}''_m) - z_1 1_{t_m} \in \mathrm{MAT}(K[z_2, z_3, z_4]),\ \textit{and}\ \tilde{C}''_m \in \mathrm{MAT}(K),$$

where the ranks of $\tilde{C}''_m$ and $\tilde{C}_m$ are the same and coincide with the number of the columns of $\tilde{C}''_m$.

Proof. It is clear that there is a $\tilde{G}_m \in GL(t_m, K)$ satisfying $\tilde{C}_m \tilde{G}_m = (0, \tilde{C}''_m)$ with a matrix $\tilde{C}''_m \in \mathrm{MAT}(K)$ such that the ranks of $\tilde{C}''_m$ and $\tilde{C}_m$ are the same and coincide with the number of the columns of $\tilde{C}''_m$. Using $\tilde{G}_m$, we have the desired relations, since $\tilde{D}_m - z_1 1_{t_m} \in \mathrm{MAT}(K[z_2, z_3, z_4])$. This proves our assertion. $\square$

Lemma 2.6. *Let the notation and the assumption be the same as in Lemma 2.2 and let q be a positive integer with $q < a$. Put $i_0 := 0$ if $n_1 > a$ and $i_0 := \max\{\ i \mid n_i = a,\ 1 \leq i \leq a\ \}$ otherwise. Then, at least one of the following three cases occurs.*

(i) *The height of the ideal in $K[z_1, z_2]$ generated by the maximal minors of the matrix $\check{U}_1 \left(\begin{smallmatrix} \\ q+1,\ldots,a \end{smallmatrix}\right)$ is greater than one.*

(ii) *We have $n_1 = a$ and there is a $\tilde{G} \in GL(a+1, K)$ representing a row operation of $\left[\begin{smallmatrix} \check{U}_{01} \\ \check{U}_1 \end{smallmatrix}\right]$ which adds multiples of $\check{U}_{01}$ to the rows of $\check{U}_1$ such that the height of the ideal in $K[z_1, z_2]$ generated by the maximal minors of $\left(\tilde{G} \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \check{U}_{01} \\ \check{U}_1 \end{smallmatrix}\right]\right) \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 \\ q+1,\ldots,a \end{smallmatrix}\right)$ is greater than one, where $\tilde{G} = \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \tilde{G}' & 0 \\ 0 & 1_{a-i_0} \end{smallmatrix}\right]$ with $\tilde{G}' \in GL(i_0+1, K)$.*

(iii) *We have* $n_1 = a$ *and there is a* $\tilde{G} \in GL(a, K)$ *such that the height of the ideal in* $K[z_1, z_2]$ *generated by the maximal minors of* $\left[\begin{smallmatrix}\tilde{G}\check{U}_1\\ \check{U}_{01}\end{smallmatrix}\right]\left(\begin{smallmatrix}1\\ q+1,\ldots,a\end{smallmatrix}\right)$ *is greater than one, where* $\tilde{G} = \left[\begin{smallmatrix}\tilde{G}' & 0\\ 0 & 1_{a-i_0}\end{smallmatrix}\right]$ *with* $\tilde{G}' \in GL(i_0, K)$.

Proof. Consider first the case $n_1 > a$. In this case, as the only polynomial in $\check{I}_K$ of degree a up to constant factors, the $\check{e}^1_1 = \det(\check{U}_1)$ must be irreducible by hypothesis and Lemma 2.3. If the height of the ideal generated by the maximal minors of $\check{U}_1\left(\begin{smallmatrix}\\ q+1,\ldots,a\end{smallmatrix}\right)$ were one, then $\det(\check{U}_1)$ would have to be divisible by a homogeneous polynomial of degree between 1 and $a-1$, in contradiction with the irreducibility of $\check{e}^1_1$. Hence we have (i). Next assume $n_1 = a$. Then, the ideal $\check{I}_K$ contains a linear combination $\check{e} = \check{c}_0\check{e}^1_1 + \check{c}_1\check{e}^2_1 + \cdots + \check{c}_{i_0}\check{e}^2_{i_0}$ ($\check{c}_i \in K,\ 0 \le i \le i_0$) which is irreducible, since there is an irreducible homogeneous polynomial of degree a in $\check{I}_K$ by Lemma 2.3. Put $\tilde{G} := \left[\begin{smallmatrix}\tilde{G}' & 0\\ 0 & 1_{a-i_0}\end{smallmatrix}\right]$ with

$$\tilde{G}' := \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \check{c}_1/\check{c}_0 & \\ \vdots & 1_{i_0} \\ \check{c}_{i_0}/\check{c}_0 & \end{bmatrix}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -\check{c}_1/\check{c}_0 & \\ \vdots & 1_{i_0} \\ -\check{c}_{i_0}/\check{c}_0 & \end{bmatrix}$$

if $\check{c}_0 \neq 0$, and

$$\tilde{G}' := \begin{bmatrix} \check{c}_1 & \check{c}_{12} & \ldots & \check{c}_{1i_0} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \check{c}_{i_0} & \check{c}_{i_02} & \ldots & \check{c}_{i_0i_0} \end{bmatrix}^{-1}$$

otherwise, where $\check{c}_{ij} \in K$ ($1 \le i \le i_0,\ 2 \le j \le i_0$) are chosen so that the inverse matrix exists. Then

$$(\check{e}^1_1, \check{e}^2_1, \ldots, \check{e}^2_a)\tilde{G}^{-1}\left(\tilde{G}\begin{bmatrix}\check{U}_{01}\\ \check{U}_1\end{bmatrix}\right) = 0, \quad (\check{e}^1_1, \check{e}^2_1, \ldots, \check{e}^2_a)\tilde{G}^{-1} = (\check{e}/\check{c}_0, \ldots)$$

or

$$(\check{e}^2_1, \ldots, \check{e}^2_a, \check{e}^1_1)\begin{bmatrix}\tilde{G}^{-1} & 0\\ 0 & 1\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix}\tilde{G}\check{U}_1\\ \check{U}_{01}\end{bmatrix} = 0, \quad (\check{e}^2_1, \ldots, \check{e}^2_a, \check{e}^1_1)\begin{bmatrix}\tilde{G}^{-1} & 0\\ 0 & 1\end{bmatrix} = (\check{e}, \ldots)$$

accordingly. By Hilbert-Burch theorem, we must have $\check{e}/\check{c}_0 = \det\left(\tilde{G}\left[\begin{smallmatrix}\check{U}_{01}\\ \check{U}_1\end{smallmatrix}\right]\left(\begin{smallmatrix}1\\ \end{smallmatrix}\right)\right)$ if $\check{c}_0 \neq 0$, and $\check{e} = \det\left(\left[\begin{smallmatrix}\tilde{G}\check{U}_1\\ \check{U}_{01}\end{smallmatrix}\right]\left(\begin{smallmatrix}1\\ \end{smallmatrix}\right)\right)$ otherwise. Hence the case (ii) or (iii) occurs for the same reason as in the case $n_1 > a$. □

Lemma 2.7. *Let* p, q *be positive integers with* $p > q$, $\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_p$ *a sequence of integers, and* U *a* $p\times q$ *matrix with components in* $k[x_1, x_2]$ *such that its columns are homogeneous elements of* $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{p} k[x_1, x_2](-\nu_i)$ *whose degrees form a nondecreasing sequence* $\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_q$. *Suppose that* $\mu_i = \nu_i + 1$ *for all* $1 \le i \le q$, *the* (i, j) *component of* U *lies in* $k[x_2]$ *for all*

$i > q$, and that the height of the ideal in $k[x_1, x_2]$ generated by the maximal minors of U is greater than one. Suppose further that

$$U - \begin{bmatrix} x_1 1_q \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathrm{MAT}(k[x_2]) \quad \textit{or} \tag{16}$$

$$U - \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & x_1 1_{q-1} \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathrm{MAT}(k[x_2]). \tag{17}$$

Then there are permutations $\iota' \in \mathfrak{S}_p$, $\iota \in \mathfrak{S}_q$ and matrices $G' \in GL(p, k[x_2])$, $G \in GL(q, k[x_2])$ with homogeneous components satisfying the following conditions.

(i) *The jth column of $G'UG$ is a homogeneous element of $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{p} k[x_1, x_2](-\nu_{\iota'(i)})$ of degree $\mu_{\iota(j)}$ for all $1 \le j \le q$.*

(ii) *The $(j + p - q, j)$ component of $G'UG$ lies in $k^* x_2^{\mu_{\iota(j)} - \nu_{\iota'(j+p-q)}}$ for all $1 \le j \le q$ and the (i, j) component is zero for all i, j with $i > j + p - q$.*

(iii) *For every $1 \le l \le q$,*

$$\sum_{j=l}^{q} (\mu_{\iota(j)} - \nu_{\iota'(j+p-q)}) \le \sum_{j=l}^{q} \mu_j - \kappa(\nu, l, p, q) + (\mu_q - \mu_l),$$

where

$$\kappa(\nu, l, p, q) := \min \left\{ \sum_{j=l}^{q} \nu_{r_j} \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{l} r_l, \dots, r_q \textit{ are distinct integers with} \\ j < r_j \le p \textit{ for all } l \le j \le q \end{array} \right\}.$$

Proof. First of all, $U\binom{1,\dots,q}{} \neq 0$, since the ideal in $k[x_1, x_2]$ generated by the maximal minors of U is of height greater than one by hypothesis. We prove our assertion by induction on q. When $q = 1$, there is an i_1 $(1 < i_1 \le p)$ such that the $(i_1, 1)$ component is $c_{i_1 1} x_2^{\mu_1 - \nu_{i_1}}$ with $c_{i_1 1} \in k^*$. Just moving the i_1th row to the last, we obtain our assertion in this case. Suppose $q > 1$ and that our assertion is true for smaller values of q. Let $\bar{u}_{i_1}$ $(q < i_1 \le p)$ be a row of U different from zero. Since the components of $\bar{u}_{i_1}$ are homogeneous elements of $k[x_2]$, they are of the form cx_2^l $(c \in k,\ l \ge 0)$. We can write $\bar{u}_{i_1} = (0, \dots, 0, c_{i_1 j_1} x_2^{\mu_{j_1} - \nu_{i_1}}, *, \dots, *)$, where $c_{i_1 j_1} x_2^{\mu_{j_1} - \nu_{i_1}}$ is the (i_1, j_1) component of U with $c_{i_1 j_1} \in k^*$. There is therefore an invertible homogeous matrix $G_1 \in GL(q, k[x_2])$ representing a column operation on U, which makes no change in the first j_1 columns, such that $\bar{u}_{i_1} G_1 = (0, \dots, 0, c_{i_1 j_1} x_2^{\mu j_1 - \nu i_1}, 0, \dots, 0)$ and the colums of UG_1 are still homogeneous elements of $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{p} k[x_1, x_2](-\nu_i)$ of degrees $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_q$. Let $G_2 \in GL(q, k)$ be the matrix representing the permutation that moves the j_1th column to the last and the jth column to the $(j-1)$th $(j_1 < j \le q)$. Put $G_1' := \begin{bmatrix} G_2^{-1} G_1^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 1_{p-q} \end{bmatrix}$ if (16) holds or $j_1 > 1$ and (17) holds. In the case $j_1 = 1$ and (17) holds, put $G_1' := \begin{bmatrix} G_2^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 1_{p-q} \end{bmatrix}$. Let further $G_2' \in GL(p, k)$ be the the matrix representing the permutation that moves the i_1th row to the last and the ith row to the $(i-1)$th $(i_1 < i \le p)$. Put $U' := G_2' G_1' U G_1 G_2$, $(\mu_1', \dots, \mu_{q-1}', \mu_q') := (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_{j_1 - 1}, \mu_{j_1+1}, \dots, \mu_q, \mu_{j_1})$

and $(\nu'_1, \dots, \nu'_{p-1}, \nu'_p) := (\nu_1, \dots, \nu_{j_1-1}, \nu_{j_1+1}, \dots, \nu_q, \nu_{j_1}, \nu_{q+1}, \dots, \nu_{i_1-1}, \nu_{i_1+1}, \dots, \nu_p, \nu_{i_1})$. Then, the jth column of U' is a homogeneous element of $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{p} k[x_1, x_2](-\nu'_i)$ of degree μ'_j for all $1 \leq j \leq q$, the (p, q) component lies in $k^* x_2^{\mu_{j_1} - \nu_{i_1}} = k^* x_2^{\mu'_q - \nu'_p}$, the (p, j) components are zero for all $j < q$, the sequence $\mu'_1, \dots, \mu'_{q-1}$ is nondecreasing, and $\mu'_i = \nu'_i + 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq q$. Moreover, $U' - \left[\begin{smallmatrix} x_1 1_q \\ 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right]$ or $U' - \left[\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & x_1 1_{q-1} \\ 0 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right]$ or $U' - \left[\begin{smallmatrix} x_1 1_{q-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right]$ lies in $\mathrm{MAT}(k[x_2])$. The height of the ideal generated by the maximal minors of $U' \left(\begin{smallmatrix} p \\ q \end{smallmatrix}\right)$ must also be greater than one. Put $U'' := U' \left(\begin{smallmatrix} p \\ q \end{smallmatrix}\right)$. By the induction hypothesis applied to U'', there are permutations $\iota'_0 \in \mathfrak{S}_{p-1}$, $\iota_0 \in \mathfrak{S}_{q-1}$ and matrices $G'_0 \in GL(p-1, k[x_2])$, $G_0 \in GL(q-1, k[x_2])$ such that the jth column of $G'_0 U'' G_0$ is a homogeneous element of $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{p-1} k[x_1, x_2](-\nu'_{\iota'_0(i)})$ of degree $\mu'_{\iota_0(j)}$ for all $1 \leq j \leq q-1$, the $(j+p-q, j)$ component of $G'_0 U'' G_0$ lies in $k^* x_2^{\mu'_{\iota_0(j)} - \nu'_{\iota'_0(j+p-q)}}$ for all $1 \leq j \leq q-1$, the (i, j) component is zero for all i, j with $i > j + p - q$, and

$$\sum_{j=l}^{q-1} (\mu'_{\iota_0(j)} - \nu'_{\iota'_0(j+p-q)}) \leq \sum_{j=l}^{q-1} \mu'_j - \kappa(\nu', l, p-1, q-1) + (\mu'_{q-1} - \mu'_l) \tag{18}$$

for every $1 \leq l \leq q-1$. There are therefore permutations ι', ι and matrices G', G such that (i) and (ii) hold. Here, we have $(\mu_{\iota(1)}, \dots, \mu_{\iota(q)}) = (\mu'_{\iota_0(1)}, \dots, \mu'_{\iota_0(q-1)}, \mu'_q)$, $(\nu_{\iota'(1)}, \dots, \nu_{\iota'(p)}) = (\nu'_{\iota'_0(1)}, \dots, \nu'_{\iota'_0(p-1)}, \nu'_p)$, $G' := \left[\begin{smallmatrix} G'_0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right] G'_2 G'_1$, and $G := G_1 G_2 \left[\begin{smallmatrix} G_0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right]$. We want to verify (iii). The case $l = q$ is easy since $\mu_{\iota(q)} = \mu_{j_1}$ and $\nu_{\iota'(p)} = \nu_{i_1}$. Let l be an integer with $1 \leq l \leq q-1$ and put

$$\delta := \sum_{j=l}^{q-1} \mu'_j - \kappa(\nu', l, p-1, q-1) + (\mu'_{q-1} - \mu'_l) + (\mu'_q - \nu'_p).$$

Since $\sum_{j=l}^{q} (\mu_{\iota(j)} - \nu_{\iota'(j+p-q)}) \leq \delta$ by (18), it is enough to show the following inequality.

Claim. With the notaion above, $\delta \leq \sum_{j=l}^{q} \mu_j - \kappa(\nu, l, p, q) + (\mu_q - \mu_l)$.

Proof of Claim. Let $r_l, \dots, r_{q-1}$ be distinct integers satisfying $j < r_j \leq p-1$ for all $l \leq j \leq q-1$ such that $\kappa(\nu', l, p-1, q-1) = \sum_{j=l}^{q-1} \nu'_{r_j}$. Then,

$$\delta = \sum_{j=l}^{q-1} \mu'_j - \sum_{j=l}^{q-1} \nu'_{r_j} + (\mu'_{q-1} - \mu'_l) + (\mu_{j_1} - \nu_{i_1}).$$

Given integers j, j' $(j < j')$ and a sequence $s_1, s_2, \dots$, denote by $T(s, j, j')$ the subsequence $s_{j+1}, \dots, s_{j'}$ with order being forgotten. Notice that $T(\nu', j, p-1) \backslash \{\nu'_q = \nu_{j_1}\} = T(\nu, j+1, p) \backslash \{\nu_{i_1}\}$ for $j_1 - 1 \leq j \leq q-1$ and that $T(\nu', j, p-1) = T(\nu, j, p) \backslash \{\nu_{i_1}\}$ for $1 \leq j \leq j_1 - 1$. Moreover

$$\kappa(\nu, l, p, q) = \min \left\{ \sum_{j=l}^{q} \nu_{r_j} \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{l} \nu_{r_j} \text{ is a term of } T(\nu, j, p) \text{ for all } l \leq j \leq q \\ \text{and } r_l, \dots, r_q \text{ are distinct} \end{array} \right\}.$$

If $1 \le l \le j_1 - 1$ and $q \notin \{r_l, \dots, r_{q-1}\}$, then $\sum_{j=l}^{j_1-1} \nu'_{r_j} + \nu_{i_1} + \sum_{j=j_1}^{q-1} \nu'_{r_j} \ge \kappa(\nu, l, p, q)$ by the above observation, so that

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta &= \sum_{j=l}^{j_1-1} \mu'_j + \mu_{j_1} + \sum_{j=j_1}^{q-1} \mu'_j - \sum_{j=l}^{j_1-1} \nu'_{r_j} - \nu_{i_1} - \sum_{j=j_1}^{q-1} \nu'_{r_j} + (\mu'_{q-1} - \mu'_l) \\
&= \sum_{j=l}^{j_1-1} \mu_j + \mu_{j_1} + \sum_{j=j_1}^{q-1} \mu_{j+1} - \sum_{j=l}^{j_1-1} \nu'_{r_j} - \nu_{i_1} - \sum_{j=j_1}^{q-1} \nu'_{r_j} + (\mu'_{q-1} - \mu'_l) \\
&\le \sum_{j=l}^{q} \mu_j - \kappa(\nu, l, p, q) + (\mu_q - \mu_l).
\end{aligned}$$

If $1 \le l \le j_1 - 1$ and $q = r_{j_2}$ for some $l \le j_2 \le q - 1$, let $r'_l, \dots, r'_{q-1}$ be the sequence obtained from $r_l, \dots, r_{q-1}$ by replacing r_{j_2} with p (i.e. $r'_{j_2} = p$ and $r'_j = r_j$ for $j \ne j_2$). Since $\nu'_{r_{j_2}} = \nu_{j_1}$, $\nu'_{r'_{j_2}} = \nu'_p = \nu_{i_1}$, and $\nu'_{r'_{j_1-1}}$ is a term of $T(\nu', j_1 - 1, p) \backslash \{\nu'_q = \nu_{j_1}\} = T(\nu, j_1, p)$, we find similarly that

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta &= \sum_{j=l}^{j_1-2} \mu_j + \mu_{j_1-1} + \mu_{j_1} + \sum_{j=j_1}^{q-1} \mu_{j+1} - \sum_{j=l}^{j_1-2} \nu'_{r'_j} - \nu_{j_1} - \nu'_{r'_{j_1-1}} - \sum_{j=j_1}^{q-1} \nu'_{r'_j} \\
&\qquad + (\mu'_{q-1} - \mu'_l) \\
&\le \sum_{j=l}^{q} \mu_j - \kappa(\nu, l, p, q) + (\mu_q - \mu_l).
\end{aligned}$$

If $j_1 \le l \le q - 1$ and $q \notin \{r_l, \dots, r_{q-1}\}$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta &= \mu_{j_1} + \sum_{j=l}^{q-1} \mu_{j+1} - \nu_{i_1} - \sum_{j=l}^{q-1} \nu'_{r_j} + (\mu'_{q-1} - \mu'_l) \\
&\le \sum_{j=l}^{q} \mu_j - \kappa(\nu, l, p, q) + (\mu_q - \mu_l).
\end{aligned}$$

If $j_1 \le l \le q - 1$ and $q = r_{j_2}$ for some $l \le j_2 \le q - 1$, let $r'_l, \dots, r'_{q-1}$ be the sequence obtained from $r_l, \dots, r_{q-1}$ by replacing r_{j_2} with p. Since $\nu'_{r_{j_2}} = \nu_{j_1}$, $\nu'_{r'_{j_2}} = \nu'_p = \nu_{i_1}$, $\mu'_{q-1} = \mu_q$, $\mu'_l = \mu_{l+1}$, and $\mu_{j_1} - \nu_{j_1} = \mu_l - \nu_l = \mu_{l+1} - \nu_{l+1} = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta &= \mu_{j_1} + \sum_{j=l}^{q-1} \mu_{j+1} - \nu_{j_1} - \sum_{j=l}^{q-1} \nu'_{r'_j} + (\mu'_{q-1} - \mu'_l) \\
&= \mu_l + \sum_{j=l}^{q-1} \mu_{j+1} - \nu_l - \sum_{j=l}^{q-1} \nu'_{r'_j} + (\mu_q - \mu_{l+1}) \\
&= \mu_l + \sum_{j=l}^{q-1} \mu_{j+1} - \nu_{l+1} - \sum_{j=l}^{q-1} \nu'_{r'_j} + (\mu_l - \nu_l) + (\nu_{l+1} - \mu_{l+1}) + (\mu_q - \mu_l)
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \mu_l + \sum_{j=l}^{q-1} \mu_{j+1} - \nu_{l+1} - \sum_{j=l}^{q-1} \nu'_{r'_j} + (\mu_q - \mu_l) \\
&\leq \sum_{j=l}^{q} \mu_j - \kappa(\nu, l, p, q) + (\mu_q - \mu_l).
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus, we have (iii), too. □

Lemma 2.8. *Let (ζ_{ij}), Γ, U_{01}, U_1 $\tilde{U}_{01}$ and $\tilde{U}_1$ be the matrices mentioned at the begininig of this section such that U_{01} and U_1 are obtained from $\tilde{U}_{01}$ and $\tilde{U}_1$ respectively by the substitution $(\zeta_{ij}) = \Gamma$, where Γ is chosen sufficiently generally. Let q be a positive integer with $q < a$. Then, there are a $a \times (a+1)$ matrix G' with components in $k[x_2]$ and a $G \in GL(q, k[x_2])$ such that the matrix $(u_{ij}) := G' \left(\left[\begin{smallmatrix} U_{01} \\ U_1 \end{smallmatrix}\right] \left(\begin{smallmatrix} \\ q+1,\ldots,a \end{smallmatrix}\right) \right) G$ satisfies the following conditions.*

(i) *Each $u_{j+a-q\,j}$ is a homogeneous element of $k[x_2] \backslash \{0\} + (x_3, x_4)R$ for all $1 \leq j \leq q$ and $u_{ij} \in (x_3, x_4)R$ for all i, j with $i > j + a - q$.*

(ii) *The degree of $\prod_{j=l}^{q} u_{j+a-q\,j}$ is less than or equal to $q - l + 1$ for all $1 \leq l \leq q$.*

Proof. Let the notation be the same as in Lemma 2.6. One of the three cases stated there occurs. Put

$$
\check{U} := \begin{cases} \check{U}_1 \begin{pmatrix} \\ q+1, \ldots, a \end{pmatrix} & \text{for the case (i),} \\[2ex] \tilde{G} \begin{bmatrix} \check{U}_{01} \\ \check{U}_1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ q+1, \ldots, a \end{pmatrix} & \text{for the case (ii).} \end{cases}
$$

Then, $\check{U} - \left[\begin{smallmatrix} z_1 1_q \\ 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right] \in \mathrm{MAT}(K[z_2])$. In the case (iii) of Lemma 2.6, we should be a little bit more careful. When $q \geq i_0$, put

$$
\check{U}' := \left(\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{G}\check{U}_1 \\ \check{U}_{01} \end{bmatrix} \tilde{G}^{-1} \right) \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ q+1, \ldots, a \end{pmatrix} = \left(\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{G}\check{U}_1 \\ \check{U}_{01} \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ q+1, \ldots, a \end{pmatrix} \right) \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{G}'^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 1_{q-i_0} \end{bmatrix},
$$

and let $\check{U}$ be the matrix obtained from $\check{U}'$ by moving the ith row to the $(i+1)$th for $1 \leq i \leq a-1$ and the last row to the first. Then $\check{U} - \left[\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & z_1 1_{q-1} \\ 0 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right] \in \mathrm{MAT}(K[z_2])$. Suppose $q < i_0$. Since $\tilde{G}'$ is an invertible matrix, $\mathrm{rank}_K(\tilde{G}' \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 \\ q+1,\ldots,i_0 \end{smallmatrix}\right)) \geq q-1$. There is therefore a $\tilde{G}'' \in GL(i_0 - 1, K)$ and a $\tilde{G}''' \in GL(q, K)$ such that $\tilde{G}'' \left(\tilde{G}' \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 \\ q+1,\ldots,i_0 \end{smallmatrix}\right) \right) \tilde{G}'''$ coincides with $\left[\begin{smallmatrix} 1_q \\ 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right]$ or $\left[\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1_{q-1} \\ 0 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right]$. Put

$$
\check{U}' := \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{G}'' & 0 \\ 0 & 1_{a+1-i_0} \end{bmatrix} \left(\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{G}\check{U}_1 \\ \check{U}_{01} \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ q+1, \ldots, a \end{pmatrix} \right) \tilde{G}'''.
$$

Then, since $\tilde{G} = \left[\begin{smallmatrix} \tilde{G}' & 0 \\ 0 & 1_{a-i_0} \end{smallmatrix}\right]$, we see

$$\begin{aligned}\check{U}' &- \begin{bmatrix} z_1\tilde{G}''\tilde{G}'\left(\begin{smallmatrix}1\\ q+1,\dots,i_0\end{smallmatrix}\right)\tilde{G}''' \\ 0\end{bmatrix}\\ &= \check{U}' - \begin{bmatrix}\tilde{G}'' & 0\\ 0 & 1_{a+1-i_0}\end{bmatrix}\left(\begin{bmatrix}\tilde{G}z_1 1_a\\ 0\end{bmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}1\\ q+1,\dots,a\end{pmatrix}\right)\tilde{G}''' \in \mathrm{MAT}(K[z_2]).\end{aligned}$$

Hence $\check{U}' - \left[\begin{smallmatrix} z_1 1_q\\ 0\end{smallmatrix}\right]$ or $\check{U}' - \left[\begin{smallmatrix}0 & 0\\ 0 & z_1 1_{q-1}\\ 0 & 0\end{smallmatrix}\right]$ lies in $\mathrm{MAT}(K[z_2])$. Now, in the case where (iii) of Lemma 2.6 holds with $q < i_0$, let $\check{U}$ be the matrix obtained from $\check{U}'$ by moving the ith row to the $(i+1)$th for $i_0 \le i \le a-1$ and the last row to the i_0th. In all the above cases, there are a $a \times (a+1)$ matrix $\tilde{G}'_0$ with components in K and a $\tilde{G}_0 \in GL(q, K)$ such that $\check{U} \equiv \tilde{G}'_0\left(\left[\begin{smallmatrix}\tilde{U}_{01}\\ \tilde{U}_1\end{smallmatrix}\right]\left(\begin{smallmatrix} \\ q+1,\dots,a\end{smallmatrix}\right)\right)\tilde{G}_0 \pmod{(z_3, z_4)R_K}$. Put $\tilde{U} := \tilde{G}'_0\left(\left[\begin{smallmatrix}\tilde{U}_{01}\\ \tilde{U}_1\end{smallmatrix}\right]\left(\begin{smallmatrix} \\ q+1,\dots,a\end{smallmatrix}\right)\right)\tilde{G}_0$ and let U_{irrd} (resp. U) denote the matrix obtained from $\tilde{U}$ (resp. $\check{U}$) by the substitution $(\zeta_{ij}) = \mathit{\Gamma}$. Since the height of the ideal in $K[z_1, z_2]$ generated by the maximal minors of $\check{U}$ is greater than one by Lemma 2.6, so is the height of the ideal in $k[x_1, x_2]$ generated by the maximal minors of U. Besides, $U_{irrd} \equiv U \pmod{(x_3, x_4)R}$. Since U is obtained in the manner above, we find that it satisfies all the hypotheses of Lemma 2.7 with $p = a$, $(\nu_1, \dots, \nu_p) = (n_1, \dots, n_a)$, and $(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_q) = (n_1 + 1, \dots, n_q + 1)$.

Let $\iota' \in \mathfrak{S}_a$, $\iota \in \mathfrak{S}_q$, $G' \in GL(a, k[x_2])$, and $G \in GL(q, k[x_2])$ be the permutations and the matrices stated in Lemma 2.7 and let u_{ij} denote the (i, j) component of $G'U_{irrd}G$. Since the components of $G'UG$ satisfy (ii) of Lemma 2.7 and since $G'U_{irrd}G \equiv G'UG \pmod{(x_3, x_4)R}$, we see that (i) holds and that the degree of $u_{j+a-q\,j}$ is $\mu_{\iota(j)} - \nu_{\iota'(j+a-q)}$. On the other hand, $\sum_{j=l}^{q} \mu_j - \kappa(\nu, l, a, q) + (\mu_q - \mu_l) = \sum_{j=l}^{q}(n_j + 1) - \sum_{i=l}^{q} n_{i+1} + (n_q - n_l) \le q - l + 1$ for all $1 \le l \le q$ by a direct computation. Since the degree of $\prod_{j=l}^{q} u_{j+a-q\,j}$ must be $\sum_{j=l}^{q}(\mu_{\iota(j)} - \nu_{\iota'(j+a-q)})$, our assertion (ii) follows from (iii) of Lemma 2.7. □

§3. Matrices that represent operations of x_1 and x_2 on the $k[x_3, x_4]$-module $\mathrm{Ext}^3_R(R/I, R)$

As seen in Section 1, the module $\mathrm{Ext}^3_R(R/I, R)$, which is the dual of $H^1_{\mathfrak{m}}(R/I)$ up to shift in grading, is isomorphic to $\mathrm{Coker}^R({}^tU_3, {}^tU_5, {}^tU_4)$. The operation of x_1 (resp. x_2) on an element of $\mathrm{Ext}^3_R(R/I, R)$ is therefore represented by the matrix ${}^t\overset{\circ}{U}_3 = x_1 1_b - {}^tU_3$ (resp. ${}^t\overset{\circ}{U}_5 = x_2 1_b - {}^tU_5$). In this section, we describe how these matrices are influenced by the structure of $\mathrm{Ext}^3_R(R/I, R)$ as an $k[x_3, x_4]$-module from a computational aspect. Our arguments below will be applied in Section 5 with $(V_3, V_5) = ({}^tU_3, {}^tU_5)$.

Assume that x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 are elements of $[R]_1$ such that $R = k[x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4]$. Let $d_1, \dots, d_Q$ be a nondecreasing sequence of integers, and V_3 and V_5 be matrices giving homogeneous homomorphisms

$$V_3,\ V_5 : \bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} R(d_i + 1) \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} R(d_i + 2)$$

of degree zero such that the components of $\mathring{V}_3 := x_1 1_Q - V_3$ and $\mathring{V}_5 := x_2 1_Q - V_5$ lie in $k[x_3, x_4]$. Suppose there are positive integers p, q with $1 \leq p < Q$, $1 \leq q \leq Q - p$ such that $d_p < d_{p+1} = d_{p+2} = \cdots = d_{p+q}$ and if $q < Q - p$ then $d_{p+q} < d_{p+q+1}$. Take an element $s \in k$ and put $\bar{x}_1 := x_1 + s x_2$, $\mathring{W} := \mathring{V}_3 + s\mathring{V}_5$, $W := \bar{x}_1 1_Q - \mathring{W} = V_3 + sV_5$. Let

$$W =: \begin{bmatrix} C' & C'' & C''' \\ D' & D'' & D''' \end{bmatrix}, \quad A' := \begin{bmatrix} C'' & C''' \\ D'' & D''' \end{bmatrix}, \quad A'' := \begin{bmatrix} C'' \\ D'' \end{bmatrix},$$

where the number of the rows of (C', C'', C''') (resp. (D', D'', D''')) is p (resp. $Q - p$), and the numbers of the columuns of D', D'', D''' are $p, q, Q - p - q$ respectively. Notice that for each row of A'' the degrees of its components are the same and that C'' is a matrix whose components are zero or of degree zero in $\bar{x}_1, x_3, x_4$. Besides, $C''' = 0$ since the degrees its components must be negative. Choose $G_1 \in GL(q, k)$ so that the columns of $C''G_1$ different from zero are linearly independent over k. Put

$$G_2 := \begin{bmatrix} 1_p & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & G_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1_{Q-p-q} \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad A := A' \begin{bmatrix} G_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1_{Q-p-q} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Observe that $\bar{x}_1$ appears in A only in the form $c\bar{x}_1$ with some $c \in k$. We may therefore write

$$A = \bar{x}_1 A_1 + A_0, \tag{19}$$

where A_1 (resp. A_0) is a matrix with entries in k (resp. $k[x_3, x_4]$) and $\varDelta(A_0) = \varDelta(A) = \varDelta(A_1) + 1$. Let S denote the graded module $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} R(d_i + 2)$ and $\deg(v)$ the degree of an element $v \in S$. We will regard the columns of A as homogeneous elements of S. Note that the degrees of the first q columns of A are the same and equal to $-1 - d_{p+1}$, while the degrees of the remaining columns are smaller than that. Let $b_1, \ldots, b_m$ be all the columns of A of degree $-1 - d_{p+1}$ which do not vanish modulo $(\bar{x}_1, x_3, x_4)$, and denote the remaining columns of A by $a_1, \ldots, a_n$. Actually, $\{b_1, \ldots, b_m\}$ consists of all the columns b of $A''G_1$ such that at least one of the first p components of b is an element of k different from zero. Let $b_i =: {}^t(b_{1i}, \ldots, b_{Qi})$ and $b_i'' := {}^t(b_{1i}, \ldots, b_{pi})$. The components of b_i'' lie in k and the vectors $b_1'', \ldots, b_m''$ are linearly independent over k by the choice of G_1. We construct a matrix H whose columns are $\bar{x}_1^{\nu_1} x_3^{\nu_3} x_4^{\nu_4} a_i$ ($\nu_1 + \nu_3 + \nu_4 + \deg(a_i) = -1 - d_{p+1}$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, ν_1, ν_3, $\nu_4 \geq 0$) arranged in a suitable order. Observe that $\deg(a_i) \leq -1 - d_{p+1}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. The first p components of a_i ($1 \leq i \leq n$) are therefore zero and so are the first p rows of H. Since $W - \bar{x}_1 1_Q \in \mathrm{MAT}(k[x_3, x_4])$, we see $A' - \left[\begin{smallmatrix} 0 \\ \bar{x}_1 1_{Q-p} \end{smallmatrix}\right] \in \mathrm{MAT}(k[x_3, x_4])$. Hence

$$G_2^{-1} A - \begin{bmatrix} O \\ \bar{x}_1 1_{Q-p} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathrm{MAT}(k[x_3, x_4]).$$

This implies that

$$\bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} k[\bar{x}_1, x_3, x_4](d_i + 2) = \mathrm{Im}^{k[\bar{x}_1, x_3, x_4]}(G_2^{-1} A) \oplus$$

$$\left(\left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^{p} k[\bar{x}_1, x_3, x_4](d_i+2)\right) \dot{\oplus} \left(\bigoplus_{i=p+1}^{Q} k[x_3, x_4](d_i+2)\right)\right)$$

by [7, Lemma 1.1], so that multiplying both sides by G_2 on the left, we get

$$\bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} k[\bar{x}_1, x_3, x_4](d_i+2) = \operatorname{Im}^{k[\bar{x}_1,x_3,x_4]}(A) \oplus \\ \left(\left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^{p} k[\bar{x}_1, x_3, x_4](d_i+2)\right) \dot{\oplus} \left(\bigoplus_{i=p+1}^{Q} k[x_3, x_4](d_i+2)\right)\right).$$

Moreover, since an element of $[k[\bar{x}_1, x_3, x_4](d_i+2)]_{-1-d_{p+1}}$ is zero or lies in k for all $1 \le i \le p$, we see

$$\begin{aligned} &\left[\bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} k[\bar{x}_1, x_3, x_4](d_i+2)\right]_{-1-d_{p+1}} \\ &\qquad = \left[\operatorname{Im}^{k[\bar{x}_1,x_3,x_4]}(A)\right]_{-1-d_{p+1}} \oplus \left[\bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} k[x_3, x_4](d_i+2)\right]_{-1-d_{p+1}} \\ &\qquad = \langle b_1, \ldots, b_m,\ H\rangle \oplus \left[\bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} k[x_3, x_4](d_i+2)\right]_{-1-d_{p+1}}, \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

where $\langle b_1, \ldots, b_m,\ H\rangle$ denotes the vector space over k spanned by $b_1, \ldots, b_m$ and the columns of H.

We will denote a matrix Z with components in R by $Z(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)$ when we want to pay attention to the variables x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4. Let $\xi,\ \eta$ be parameters over R. For a matrix $Z = Z(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)$ with components in R, let $\tilde{Z} = \tilde{Z}(\xi, \eta, x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) := Z(x_1, x_2, x_3 + \xi\bar{x}_1, x_4 + \eta\bar{x}_1)$ and $\bar{Z} = \bar{Z}(\xi, \eta, x_1, x_2) := Z(x_1, x_2, \xi\bar{x}_1, \eta\bar{x}_1)$. Observe that

$$\bar{Z}(x_3/\bar{x}_1, x_4/\bar{x}_1, x_1, x_2) = Z(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4). \tag{21}$$

Now we consider $b_1, \ldots, b_m$ and H. Notice that their components are polynomials in $\bar{x}_1, x_3, x_4$. With the notation above, the components of $\tilde{b}_1, \ldots, \tilde{b}_m$ and $\tilde{H}$, therefore, lie in $k[\bar{x}_1, x_3, x_4, \xi, \eta] = k[\bar{x}_1, x_3, x_4] \otimes_k k[\xi, \eta]$. Let T be the local ring $k[\xi, \eta]_{(\xi,\eta)}$ and let $\langle \tilde{b}_1, \ldots, \tilde{b}_m,\ \tilde{H}\rangle_T$ denote the submodule of

$$\left[\bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} k[\bar{x}_1, x_3, x_4](d_i+2) \otimes_k T\right]_{-1-d_{p+1}}$$

spanned over T by $\tilde{b}_1, \ldots, \tilde{b}_m$ and the columns of $\tilde{H}$, where $[S \otimes_k T]_\rho = [S]_\rho \otimes_k T$ for $\rho \in \mathbf{Z}$. Since $\tilde{b}_i(0, 0, x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) = b_i$ $(1 \le i \le m)$ and $\tilde{H}(0, 0, x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) = H$, we find by (20) that

$$\left[\bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} k[\bar{x}_1, x_3, x_4](d_i+2) \otimes_k T\right]_{-1-d_{p+1}}$$
$$= \langle \tilde{b}_1, \ldots, \tilde{b}_m,\ \tilde{H}\rangle_T \oplus \left[\bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} k[x_3, x_4](d_i+2) \otimes_k T\right]_{-1-d_{p+1}}. \quad (22)$$

Put

$$N_p := 0^p \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{i=p+1}^{Q} k[x_3, x_4](d_i+2)\right) \subset \left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} k[x_3, x_4](d_i+2)\right).$$

This is a module over $k[x_3, x_4]$ consisting of all the elements of $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} k[x_3, x_4](d_i+2) \subset S$ such that the first p components are zero. Let $v = v(x_3, x_4)$ $(= v(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4))$ be an element of $\left[N_p\right]_{-1-d_{p+1}}$. We can write

$$\tilde{v}(\xi, \eta, x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)$$
$$= \sum_{i=1}^{m} \tilde{b}_i(\xi, \eta, x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)\hat{g}_i + \tilde{H}(\xi, \eta, x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) \cdot {}^t(\hat{f}_1, \ldots, \hat{f}_l) + w \quad (23)$$

with $\hat{g}_i,\ \hat{f}_i \in T$ and $w \in \left[\bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} k[x_3, x_4](d_i+2) \otimes_k T\right]_{-1-d_{p+1}}$ by (22), where l denotes the number of the columns of H.

Lemma 3.1. *Let v and w be as above. Suppose that $w \equiv 0 \pmod{(x_3, x_4)}$. Then*

$$\bar{x}_1^{\nu} v \in \mathrm{Im}^{k[\bar{x}_1, x_3, x_4]}(a_1, \ldots, a_n) \oplus N_p$$

for all $\nu \geq 0$.

Proof. Since $v \in [N_p]_{-1-d_{p+1}}$ by hypotheses, the first p components of $\tilde{v}$ are zero. Besides, since an element of $[k[\bar{x}_1, x_3, x_4](d_i+2) \otimes_k T]_{-1-d_{p+1}}$ is zero or lies in T for $1 \leq i \leq p$, it follows from the assumption $w \equiv 0 \pmod{(x_3, x_4)}$ that the first p components of w are also zero. On the other hand, the vectors $\tilde{b}_i''$ $(1 \leq i \leq m)$ are linearly independent over T and the first p components of the columns of $\tilde{H}$ are zero, since these properties are inherited from $b_1'', \ldots, b_m''$ and H. Hence, $\hat{g}_i = 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$. In other words

$$\tilde{v}(\xi, \eta, x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) = \tilde{H}(\xi, \eta, x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) \cdot {}^t(\hat{f}_1, \ldots, \hat{f}_l) + w,$$

so that

$$\bar{v}(\xi, \eta, x_1, x_2) = \bar{H}(\xi, \eta, x_1, x_2) \cdot {}^t(\hat{f}_1, \ldots, \hat{f}_l).$$

Let $\nu \geq 0$ be an integer. Since the denominators of $\hat{f}_i$ $(1 \leq i \leq l)$ lies in $k^* + (\xi, \eta)$, there is a polynomial $\psi_0 \in (\xi, \eta)^{\nu+1}$ such that $\psi_i := (1 + \psi_0)\hat{f}_i \in k[\xi, \eta]$ for all $1 \leq i \leq l$. Hence

$$(1 + \psi_0)\bar{x}_1^{\nu}\bar{v}(\xi, \eta, x_1, x_2) = \bar{x}_1^{\nu}\bar{H}(\xi, \eta, x_1, x_2) \cdot {}^t(\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_l).$$

Now substitute $x_3/\bar{x}_1$ and $x_4/\bar{x}_1$ for ξ and η respectively in this equality. We find by (21) that

$$\begin{aligned}&(1+\psi_0(x_3/\bar{x}_1, x_4/\bar{x}_1))\bar{x}_1^{\nu}v(x_3,x_4)\\ &\qquad\qquad = \bar{x}_1^{\nu}H(x_1,x_2,x_3,x_4)\cdot {}^t(\psi_1(x_3/\bar{x}_1,x_4/\bar{x}_1),\ldots,\psi_l(x_3/\bar{x}_1,x_4/\bar{x}_1)).\end{aligned}$$

Write

$$\psi_j(x_3/\bar{x}_1, x_4/\bar{x}_1) = \sum_{\mu\geq 0}\psi_{j\mu}(x_3,x_4)/\bar{x}_1^{\mu}$$

for $0 \leq j \leq l$, where $\psi_{j\mu}(x_3,x_4)$ is a homogeneous polynomials in x_3, x_4 of degree μ for each j, μ. Notice that $\psi_{0\mu} = 0$ for $\mu \leq \nu$. Moreover, we can write $a_i = \bar{x}_1 a_{i1} + a_{i0}$ by (19), where a_{i1} (resp. a_{i0}) is a column of A_1 (resp. A_0). Compare terms with no factor $\bar{x}_1$ in the denominators in the above equality. Then, since $v \in \bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} k[x_3,x_4](d_i+2)$ and each column of H is of the form $\bar{x}_1^{\nu_1}x_3^{\nu_3}x_4^{\nu_4}a_i$, we find that $\bar{x}_1^{\nu}v$ is the sum of a finite number of vectors of the forms

$$\begin{aligned}&\bar{x}_1^{\nu_1+\nu-\mu}x_3^{\nu_3}x_4^{\nu_4}\psi_{j\mu}(x_3,x_4)a_i\\ &\qquad(\deg(a_i)+\nu_1+\nu_3+\nu_4 = -1-d_{p+1},\ \nu_1,\ \nu_3,\ \nu_4\geq 0,\ \nu_1+\nu\geq\mu,\\ &\qquad\qquad 1\leq i\leq n,\ 1\leq j\leq l)\quad\text{and}\\ &x_3^{\nu_3}x_4^{\nu_4}\psi_{j\nu_1+\nu+1}(x_3,x_4)a_{i1}\\ &\qquad(\deg(a_i)+\nu_1+\nu_3+\nu_4 = -1-d_{p+1},\ \nu_1,\ \nu_3,\ \nu_4\geq 0,\\ &\qquad\qquad 1\leq i\leq n,\ 1\leq j\leq l).\end{aligned}$$

Since the first p components of a_{i1} are zero for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, our assertion holds. □

Lemma 3.2. *Assumption being the same as in Lemma 3.1, we have*

$$\mathring{W}^{\nu}v \in N_p$$

for all $\nu \geq 0$.

Proof. For $\nu = 0$, our assertion is trivial. Suppose $\nu > 0$. Using the equality $W = \bar{x}_1 1_Q - \mathring{W}$, we see

$$\bar{x}_1^{\nu}v = W\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\nu}\bar{x}_1^{\nu-i}\mathring{W}^{i-1}\right)v + \mathring{W}^{\nu}v.$$

On the other hand, $\bar{x}_1^{\nu}v = \varphi_1 + \varphi_2$ with $\varphi_1 \in \mathrm{Im}^{k[\bar{x}_1,x_3,x_4]}(a_1,\ldots,a_n) \subset \mathrm{Im}^{k[\bar{x}_1,x_3,x_4]}(W)$, $\varphi_2 \in N_p$ by Lemma 3.1. The vector $\varphi_2 - \mathring{W}^{\nu}v$ is therefore contained in $\mathrm{Im}^{k[\bar{x}_1,x_3,x_4]}(W)$. Since the components of $\varphi_2 - \mathring{W}^{\nu}v$ are all contained in $k[x_3,x_4]$ and W is a square matrix such that $W = \bar{x}_1 1_Q - \mathring{W}$ with $\mathring{W} \in \mathrm{MAT}(k[x_3,x_4])$, it follows that $\varphi_2 - \mathring{W}^{\nu}v = 0$. Hence $\mathring{W}^{\nu}v \in N_p$. □

Lemma 3.3. *Let* V_3, V_5, d_i $(1 \leq i \leq Q)$, p, q, N_p, ξ, η, T *be as above. Let* $v_1, \dots, v_\delta$ *be homogeneous elements of* $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} k[x_3, x_4](d_i + 2)$ *and* v *an element of* $[N_p]_{-1-d_{p+1}} \cap \operatorname{Im}^{k[x_3,x_4]}(v_1, \dots, v_\delta)$*. Suppose that one of the following two conditions holds:*

(i) $d_{p+1} > d_p + 1$,

(ii) $d_{p+1} = d_p + 1$ *and the number of the minimal generators of the* $k[x_3, x_4]$*-module*

$$\bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} R(d_i + 2) / \operatorname{Im}^R(V_3, V_5, v_1, \dots, v_\delta)$$

of degree $-1 - d_{p+1}$ *is* $q' := \max\{\, i \mid d_{p-i+1} = \dots = d_{p-1} = d_p \,\}$ *and remains unchanged for any small homogeneous transformation of variables* x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4*.*

Then, for every $s \in k$*, the element* w *of* $\left[\bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} k[x_3, x_4](d_i + 2) \otimes_k T\right]_{-1-d_{p+1}}$ *defined by the equality* (23) *must be congruent to zero modulo* (x_3, x_4)*.*

Proof. In the case (i), we get our assertion, taking the degrees of the components of v and w into account. Let us go on the case (ii). Let $s \in k$, and let $\bar{x}_1$, W, A, b_i $(1 \leq i \leq m)$, and H be as above. We want to consider $\operatorname{Coker}^{R \otimes_k k[\xi,\eta]}(\tilde{V}_3, \tilde{V}_5, \tilde{v}_1, \dots, \tilde{v}_\delta)$, where $\tilde{V}_i = \tilde{V}(\xi, \eta, x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)$ $(i = 3, 5)$ and $\tilde{v}_j = \tilde{v}_j(\xi, \eta, x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)$ $(1 \leq j \leq \delta)$. It follows from the equality

$$\bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} R(d_i + 2) = \operatorname{Im}^R(V_3, V_5) + \left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} k[x_3, x_4](d_i + 2)\right)$$

that

$$\bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} R(d_i + 2) \otimes_k T = \operatorname{Im}^{R \otimes_k T}(\tilde{V}_3, \tilde{V}_5) + \left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} k[x_3, x_4](d_i + 2) \otimes_k T\right).$$

Hence

$$\left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} R(d_i + 2) \otimes_k k[\xi, \eta]_\psi\right) / \operatorname{Im}^{R \otimes_k k[\xi,\eta]_\psi}(\tilde{V}_3, \tilde{V}_5, \tilde{v}_1, \dots, \tilde{v}_\delta)$$
$$\cong \left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} k[x_3, x_4](d_i + 2) \otimes_k k[\xi, \eta]_\psi\right) / (k[x_3, x_4] \otimes_k k[\xi, \eta]_\psi) E'' \quad (24)$$

over $k[x_3, x_4] \otimes_k k[\xi, \eta]_\psi$ for some $\psi \in k[\xi, \eta] \backslash (\xi, \eta)$, where

$$E'' := \operatorname{Im}^{R \otimes_k k[\xi,\eta]}(\tilde{V}_3, \tilde{V}_5, \tilde{v}_1, \dots, \tilde{v}_\delta) \cap \left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} k[x_3, x_4](d_i + 2) \otimes_k k[\xi, \eta]\right).$$

Let w be the element of $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} k[x_3, x_4](d_i + 2) \otimes_k T$ of degree $-1 - d_{p+1}$ such that the equality (23) holds. The vectors $\tilde{b}_i$ $(1 \leq i \leq m)$ and the columns of $\tilde{H}$ are contained in

$\mathrm{Im}^{R\otimes_k T}(\tilde{V}_3) + \mathrm{Im}^{R\otimes_k T}(\tilde{V}_5)$, and $\tilde{v} \in \mathrm{Im}^{R\otimes_k T}(\tilde{v}_1, \ldots, \tilde{v}_\delta)$, so that $w \in (k[x_3, x_4] \otimes_k T)E''$. Let $\phi_i := {}^t(0, \ldots, 0, \overset{\overset{i}{\smile}}{1}, 0, \ldots, 0)$ $(1 \leq i \leq Q)$ be the canonical bases of $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} k[x_3, x_4](d_i + 2) \otimes_k k[\xi, \eta]$. Then $\deg(\phi_i) = -1 - d_{p+1}$ if and only if $p - q' + 1 \leq i \leq p$. Since the parameters ξ, η correspond to a small homogeneous transformation of the variables x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, our hypothesis implies by (24) that the q' vectors $\phi_{p-q'+1}, \ldots, \phi_p$ must be linearly independent over $k(\mathfrak{p})$ in $\left(\left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} k[x_3, x_4](d_i + 2) \otimes_k k[\xi, \eta]\right) / E''\right) \otimes k(\mathfrak{p})$ for all points $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathrm{Spec}(k[\xi, \eta])$ in a neighborhood of the origin $\xi = \eta = 0$. We find therefore that the first p components of any element of E'' of degree $-1 - d_{p+1}$ must be zero. Hence $w \equiv 0 \pmod{(x_3, x_4)}$. $\square$

§4. Structure of $\mathrm{Im}^{R}({}^t U_4)$

To investigate the structure of $\mathrm{Coker}^R({}^t U_3, {}^t U_5, {}^t U_4)$ as a $k[x_3, x_4]$-module, one needs to know the behavior of ${}^t\mathring{U}_3$, ${}^t\mathring{U}_5$ and their multiples more intimately. This section is devoted to a description of some rudimentary properties concerned with it.

Let V_3, V_5, $\mathring{V}_3$, $\mathring{V}_5$ and d_i $(1 \leq i \leq Q)$ be the same as in the previous section. Here, we think of V_3, V_5, $\mathring{V}_3$, $\mathring{V}_5$ as homogeneous linear mappings of degree one from $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} R(d_i + 2)$ to itself.

Lemma 4.1. *Let V_3, V_5, $\mathring{V}_3$, $\mathring{V}_5$, d_i $(1 \leq i \leq Q)$ be as above and let Ξ denote the module generated over $k[x_3, x_4]$ by the columns of $[\mathring{V}_3, \mathring{V}_5] := \mathring{V}_3\mathring{V}_5 - \mathring{V}_5\mathring{V}_3$. Let further $\mu \geq 0$, $\nu \geq 0$ be integers and $(p_1, \ldots, p_{\mu+\nu})$ be a $(\mu + \nu)$-tuple of integers such that $\mu = \#\{\ i \mid p_i = 3\ \}$, $\nu = \#\{\ i \mid p_i = 5\ \}$. Then for every $v \in \bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} k[x_3, x_4](d_i + 2)$, we have*

$$\left(\prod_{i=1}^{\mu+\nu} \mathring{V}_{p_i}\right) v \in \mathring{V}_3{}^{\mu}\mathring{V}_5{}^{\nu} v + \sum_{\substack{m \geq 0,\ n \geq 0, \\ 0 \leq m+n < \mu+\nu}} \mathring{V}_3{}^{m}\mathring{V}_5{}^{n}\,\Xi,$$

where $\prod_{i=1}^{\mu+\nu} \mathring{V}_{p_i}$ stands for 1_Q in the case $\mu = \nu = 0$.

Proof. Put $l = \mu + \nu$. Let μ'', ν'' be integers with $\mu'' \geq 0$, $\nu'' > 0$ and let $l'' := \mu'' + \nu'' \leq l$. Assume that $p_i = 3$ for $i \leq \mu''$, $p_i = 5$ for $\mu'' + 1 \leq i \leq l''$ and that $p_{l''+1} = 3$ if $l'' < l$. If $l'' = l$, then $\mu = \mu''$, $\nu = \nu''$ and $\left(\prod_{i=1}^{l} \mathring{V}_{p_i}\right) v = \mathring{V}_3{}^{\mu}\mathring{V}_5{}^{\nu} v$. Suppose $l'' < l$ and let $v' := \left(\prod_{i=l''+2}^{l} \mathring{V}_{p_i}\right) v \in \bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} k[x_3, x_4](d_i + 2)$. Then, using the equality

$$\mathring{V}_3{}^{\mu''}\mathring{V}_5{}^{\nu''}\mathring{V}_3 \cdot v' = \mathring{V}_3{}^{\mu''}\mathring{V}_5{}^{\nu''-1}\mathring{V}_3\mathring{V}_5 \cdot v' - \mathring{V}_3{}^{\mu''}\mathring{V}_5{}^{\nu''-1}[\mathring{V}_3, \mathring{V}_5]v'$$

repeatedly, we find

$$\left(\prod_{i=1}^{l} \mathring{V}_{p_i}\right) v = \mathring{V}_5{}^{\mu''}\mathring{V}_3{}^{\nu''}\mathring{V}_5 \cdot v' \in \mathring{V}_5{}^{\mu''+1}\mathring{V}_3{}^{\nu''} v' + \sum_{\substack{m \geq 0,\ n \geq 0, \\ 0 \leq m+n < \mu+\nu}} \mathring{V}_5{}^{m}\mathring{V}_3{}^{n}\,\Xi.$$

Since $\mu'' + 1 + \nu'' > l''$, our assertion follows by ascending induction on l''. $\square$

For each pair of integers μ, ν with $\mu \geq 0$, $\nu \geq 0$, put

$$L_{\mu,\nu} := \sum_{\substack{(p_1,\dots,p_{\mu+\nu}) \text{ such that} \\ \#\{i|p_i=3\}=\mu \text{ and } \#\{i|p_i=5\}=\nu}} \prod_{j=1}^{\mu+\nu} \overset{\circ}{V}_{p_j},$$

where $L_{0,0} = 1_Q$.

Corollary 4.2. *Let V_3, V_5, $\overset{\circ}{V}_3$, $\overset{\circ}{V}_5$, d_i $(1 \leq i \leq Q)$, and Ξ be as in Lemma 4.1. Then,*

$$\binom{\mu+\nu}{\mu} \overset{\circ}{V}_3{}^{\mu} \overset{\circ}{V}_5{}^{\nu} v \in L_{\mu,\nu} v + \sum_{\substack{m \geq 0,\ n \geq 0, \\ 0 \leq m+n < \mu+\nu}} \overset{\circ}{V}_3{}^{m} \overset{\circ}{V}_5{}^{n} \Xi$$

for every $v \in \bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} k[x_3, x_4](d_i + 2)$ and every pair μ, ν of integers with $\mu \geq 0, \nu \geq 0$.

Proof. With the notation of Lemma 4.1,

$$\overset{\circ}{V}_3{}^{\mu} \overset{\circ}{V}_5{}^{\nu} v \in \left(\prod_{i=1}^{\mu+\nu} \overset{\circ}{V}_{p_i} \right) v + \sum_{\substack{m \geq 0,\ n \geq 0, \\ 0 \leq m+n < \mu+\nu}} \overset{\circ}{V}_3{}^{m} \overset{\circ}{V}_5{}^{n} \Xi.$$

Our assertion follows by summing up all the above relations such that $\#\{\ i \mid p_i = 3\ \} = \mu$ and $\#\{\ i \mid p_i = 5\ \} = \nu$. ☐

Lemma 4.3. *Let V_3, V_5, $\overset{\circ}{V}_3$ and $\overset{\circ}{V}_5$ be as in Lemma 4.1, and v be an element of $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} k[x_3, x_4](d_i + 2)$. Then,*

$$x_2^{\mu} v \in \operatorname{Im}^{k[x_2,x_3,x_4]}(V_5) + \overset{\circ}{V}_5{}^{\mu} \cdot v, \quad x_1^{\mu} v \in \operatorname{Im}^{R}(V_3) + \overset{\circ}{V}_3{}^{\mu} \cdot v$$

for all $\mu \geq 1$. If further $v \in (x_3, x_4) \bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} k[x_3, x_4](d_i + 2)$, then

$$x_2^{\mu} v \in (x_3, x_4) \operatorname{Im}^{k[x_2,x_3,x_4]}(V_5) + \overset{\circ}{V}_5{}^{\mu} \cdot v, \quad x_1^{\mu} v \in (x_3, x_4) \operatorname{Im}^{R}(V_3) + \overset{\circ}{V}_3{}^{\mu} \cdot v$$

for all $\mu \geq 1$.

Proof. First we have

$$x_2 v = (x_2 1_Q) v = (V_5 + \overset{\circ}{V}_5) v \in \operatorname{Im}^{k[x_2,x_3,x_4]}(V_5) + \overset{\circ}{V}_5 \cdot v.$$

Inductively,

$$\begin{aligned} x_2^{\mu} v = x_2(x_2^{\mu-1} v) &\in x_2(\operatorname{Im}^{k[x_2,x_3,x_4]}(V_5) + \overset{\circ}{V}_5{}^{\mu-1} \cdot v) \\ &\subset \operatorname{Im}^{k[x_2,x_3,x_4]}(V_5) + V_5(\overset{\circ}{V}_5{}^{\mu-1} \cdot v) + \overset{\circ}{V}_5(\overset{\circ}{V}_5{}^{\mu-1} \cdot v) \\ &= \operatorname{Im}^{k[x_2,x_3,x_4]}(V_5) + \overset{\circ}{V}_5{}^{\mu} \cdot v \end{aligned}$$

for $\mu \geq 1$. Likewise,

$$x_1^{\mu} v \in \operatorname{Im}^{k[x_1,x_3,x_4]}(V_3) + \overset{\circ}{V}_3{}^{\mu} \cdot v \subset \operatorname{Im}^{R}(V_3) + \overset{\circ}{V}_3{}^{\mu} \cdot v$$

for $\mu \geq 1$. If $v \in (x_3, x_4) \bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} k[x_3, x_4](d_i + 2)$, then $v = x_3 v' + x_4 v''$ with $v', v'' \in \bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} k[x_3, x_4](d_i + 2)$. Hence

$$x_2^{\mu} v = x_3 x_2^{\mu} v' + x_4 x_2^{\mu} v'' \in (x_3, x_4) \operatorname{Im}^{k[x_2,x_3,x_4]}(V_5) + \mathring{V}_5{}^{\mu} \cdot v.$$

The same holds for $x_1^{\mu} v$. $\square$

Lemma 4.4. *Let* V_3, V_5, $\mathring{V}_3$, $\mathring{V}_5$ *and* $\varXi$ *be as in Lemma 4.1. Let* $v_1, \ldots, v_\delta$ *be elements of* $(x_3, x_4) \bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} k[x_3, x_4](d_i + 2)$ *and* P *the module generated over* $k[x_3, x_4]$ *by them. Then*

$$\begin{aligned}
(x_3, x_4) \operatorname{Im}^{R}(V_3, V_5) &+ \operatorname{Im}^{R}(v_1, \ldots, v_\delta) \\
&= (x_3, x_4) \operatorname{Im}^{R}(V_3) \oplus (x_3, x_4) \operatorname{Im}^{k[x_2,x_3,x_4]}(V_5) \\
&\qquad \oplus \sum_{\mu \geq 0,\ \nu \geq 0} \left(x_3 \mathring{V}_3{}^{\mu} \mathring{V}_5{}^{\nu} \varXi + x_4 \mathring{V}_3{}^{\mu} \mathring{V}_5{}^{\nu} \varXi + \mathring{V}_3{}^{\mu} \mathring{V}_5{}^{\nu} P \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let E (resp. M) denote the right (resp. left) hand side of the above equality. We want to show first that E is an R-module. With the use of Lemma 4.3, we see

$$\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{Im}^{k[x_2,x_3,x_4]}([\mathring{V}_3, \mathring{V}_5]) &= \sum_{\mu \geq 0} x_2^{\mu} \operatorname{Im}^{k[x_3,x_4]}([\mathring{V}_3, \mathring{V}_5]) \\
&\subset \operatorname{Im}^{k[x_2,x_3,x_4]}(V_5) + \sum_{\mu \geq 0} \mathring{V}_5{}^{\mu} \operatorname{Im}^{k[x_3,x_4]}([\mathring{V}_3, \mathring{V}_5]) \\
&= \operatorname{Im}^{k[x_2,x_3,x_4]}(V_5) + \sum_{\mu \geq 0} \mathring{V}_5{}^{\mu} \varXi.
\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

Let $(p_1, \ldots, p_{\mu+\nu})$ be a $(\mu + \nu)$-tuple of integers such that $\mu = \#\{\ i \mid p_i = 3\ \}$, $\nu = \#\{\ i \mid p_i = 5\ \}$, and l be an integer with $1 \leq l \leq \delta$. Since $v_l = x_3 v_l' + x_4 v_l''$ with $v_l', v_l'' \in \bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} k[x_3, x_4](d_i + 2)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\prod_{i=1}^{\mu+\nu} \mathring{V}_{p_i} \right) v_l &= x_3 \left(\prod_{i=1}^{\mu+\nu} \mathring{V}_{p_i} \right) v_l' + x_4 \left(\prod_{i=1}^{\mu+\nu} \mathring{V}_{p_i} \right) v_l'' \\
&\in x_3 \mathring{V}_3{}^{\mu} \mathring{V}_5{}^{\nu} v_l' + x_3 \sum_{m \geq 0,\ n \geq 0} \mathring{V}_3{}^{m} \mathring{V}_5{}^{n} \varXi \\
&\qquad + x_4 \mathring{V}_3{}^{\mu} \mathring{V}_5{}^{\nu} v_l'' + x_4 \sum_{m \geq 0,\ n \geq 0} \mathring{V}_3{}^{m} \mathring{V}_5{}^{n} \varXi \\
&= \mathring{V}_3{}^{\mu} \mathring{V}_5{}^{\nu} v_l + \sum_{m \geq 0,\ n \geq 0} \left(x_3 \mathring{V}_3{}^{m} \mathring{V}_5{}^{n} \varXi + x_4 \mathring{V}_3{}^{m} \mathring{V}_5{}^{n} \varXi \right)
\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

by Lemma 4.1. For $w \in \bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} k[x_2, x_3, x_4](d_i + 2)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
x_1 V_5 \cdot w &= (x_1 1_Q) V_5 \cdot w = (V_3 + \mathring{V}_3) V_5 \cdot w \\
&= V_3 (V_5 \cdot w) + V_5 \mathring{V}_3 \cdot w + [\mathring{V}_3, V_5] w \\
&= V_3 (V_5 \cdot w) + V_5 \mathring{V}_3 \cdot w - [\mathring{V}_3, \mathring{V}_5] w \\
&\in \operatorname{Im}^{R}(V_3) + \operatorname{Im}^{k[x_2,x_3,x_4]}(V_5) + \operatorname{Im}^{k[x_2,x_3,x_4]}([\mathring{V}_3, \mathring{V}_5]).
\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

Hence

$$x_1(x_3, x_4)\operatorname{Im}^{k[x_2,x_3,x_4]}(V_5) \subset E \tag{28}$$

by (25) and (27). Using Lemma 4.3 with $\mu = 1$, together with Lemma 4.1 and (26), we see

$$x_i\left(x_3\mathring{V}_3{}^{\mu}\mathring{V}_5{}^{\nu}\varXi + x_4\mathring{V}_3{}^{\mu}\mathring{V}_5{}^{\nu}\varXi + \mathring{V}_3{}^{\mu}\mathring{V}_5{}^{\nu}P\right) \subset E \tag{29}$$

for $i = 1,\ 2$. Thus E is a module over R by (28) and (29). Moreover the columns of the matrices x_jV_i $(i \in \{3,5\},\ j \in \{3,4\})$ and the elements $v_1,\dots,v_\delta$ are contained in E. Hence $M \subset E$. To complete the proof of our assertion, it remains to prove that

$$x_3\mathring{V}_3{}^{\mu}\mathring{V}_5{}^{\nu}\varXi + x_4\mathring{V}_3{}^{\mu}\mathring{V}_5{}^{\nu}\varXi + \mathring{V}_3{}^{\mu}\mathring{V}_5{}^{\nu}P \subset M.$$

Let $v = x_3v' + x_4v''$ be an arbitrary element of $(x_3,x_4)\bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q}R(d_i+2)$. Then, by the same computation as in the proof of Lemma 4.3 with $\mu = 1$, we see

$$\mathring{V}_3\cdot v \in (x_3,x_4)\operatorname{Im}^R(V_3) + x_1v \quad\text{and}\quad \mathring{V}_5\cdot v \in (x_3,x_4)\operatorname{Im}^R(V_5) + x_2v.$$

This means that $\mathring{V}_3{}^{\mu}\mathring{V}_5{}^{\nu}v \in M$ whenever $v \in M$. Since the columns of $[\mathring{V}_3,\mathring{V}_5] = [V_3,V_5]$ are elments of $\operatorname{Im}^R(V_3) + \operatorname{Im}^R(V_5)$, the sets $x_j\varXi$ $(j = 3,4)$ are contained in M. Besides, it is clear that $P \subset M$. Hence, $x_3\mathring{V}_3{}^{\mu}\mathring{V}_5{}^{\nu}\varXi + x_4\mathring{V}_3{}^{\mu}\mathring{V}_5{}^{\nu}\varXi + \mathring{V}_3{}^{\mu}\mathring{V}_5{}^{\nu}P \subset M$. ☐

Corollary 4.5. *With the notation of Lemma 4.4,*

$$\begin{aligned}\big((x_3,x_4)\operatorname{Im}^R(V_3,V_5) + \operatorname{Im}^R(v_1,\dots,v_\delta)\big) \cap \bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} k[x_3,x_4](d_i+2)\\ = \sum_{\mu\ge 0,\ \nu\ge 0}\left(x_3\mathring{V}_3{}^{\mu}\mathring{V}_5{}^{\nu}\varXi + x_4\mathring{V}_3{}^{\mu}\mathring{V}_5{}^{\nu}\varXi + \mathring{V}_3{}^{\mu}\mathring{V}_5{}^{\nu}P\right).\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let v be an element of the left hand side of the above equality. Then, by Lemma 4.4, $v = \varphi_1 + \varphi_2 + \varphi_3$ with $\varphi_1 \in (x_3,x_4)\operatorname{Im}^R(V_3)$, $\varphi_2 \in (x_3,x_4)\operatorname{Im}^{k[x_2,x_3,x_4]}(V_5)$ and $\varphi_3 \in \sum_{\mu\ge 0,\ \nu\ge 0}\left(x_3\mathring{V}_3{}^{\mu}\mathring{V}_5{}^{\nu}\varXi + x_4\mathring{V}_3{}^{\mu}\mathring{V}_5{}^{\nu}\varXi + \mathring{V}_3{}^{\mu}\mathring{V}_5{}^{\nu}P\right)$. Since $v - \varphi_3 = \varphi_1 + \varphi_2$ lies in $\left(\operatorname{Im}^R(V_3) \oplus \operatorname{Im}^{k[x_2,x_3,x_4]}(V_5)\right) \cap \bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} k[x_3,x_4](d_i+2) = 0$, one sees that v and φ_3 must coincide. Hence the left hand side is contained in the right hand side. The inclusion of the other direction is obvious. ☐

Proposition 4.6. *Assume that* $\operatorname{char}(k) = 0$. *Let* $\mathring{V}_3$, $\mathring{V}_5$, $\varXi$, $v_1,\dots,v_\delta$ *and* P *be as in Lemma 4.4. Suppose that* $v_1,\dots,v_\delta$ *are homogeneous and that there is a homogeneous submodule* P_0 *of* $(x_3,x_4)\bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} k[x_3,x_4](d_i+2)$ *over* $k[x_3,x_4]$ *satisfying*

$$\begin{cases}\varXi \subset \displaystyle\sum_{\nu\ge 0}\mathring{V}_5{}^{\nu}P_0 + P,\\ x_iP_0 \subset P_0 + (x_3,x_4)\operatorname{Im}^R(V_3,V_5) + \operatorname{Im}^R(v_1,\dots,v_\delta)\end{cases} \tag{30}$$

for $i = 1, 2$. *Then,*

$$\sum_{\mu\ge 0,\ \nu\ge 0}\mathring{V}_3{}^{\mu}\mathring{V}_5{}^{\nu}(P_0 + P) = P_0 + \sum_{m\ge 0,\ n\ge 0} L_{m,n}P.$$

Proof. Since $v_j = x_3 v'_j + x_4 v''_j$ with $v'_j, v''_j \in \bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} k[x_3, x_4](d_i + 2)$, it follows from Corollary 4.2 that

$$\binom{\mu+\nu}{\mu} \mathring{V}_3{}^{\mu} \mathring{V}_5{}^{\nu} v_j \in L_{\mu,\nu} v_j + \sum_{\substack{m \geq 0,\ n \geq 0, \\ 0 \leq m+n < \mu+\nu}} \left(x_3 \mathring{V}_3{}^{m} \mathring{V}_5{}^{n} \varXi + x_4 \mathring{V}_3{}^{m} \mathring{V}_5{}^{n} \varXi \right) \tag{31}$$

for all $1 \leq j \leq \delta$ and all pairs of integers μ, ν with $\mu \geq 0$, $\nu \geq 0$, in the same manner as in (26). Let v be a homogeneous element of P_0. We have

$$x_1^{\mu} x_2^{\nu} v \in P_0 + (x_3, x_4) \operatorname{Im}^R(V_3, V_5) + \operatorname{Im}^R(v_1, \ldots, v_\delta)$$

by (30). There are homogeneous elements $v' \in P_0$, $\varphi_1 \in (x_3, x_4) \operatorname{Im}^R(V_3)$, $\varphi_2 \in (x_3, x_4) \operatorname{Im}^{k[x_2,x_3,x_4]}(V_5)$ and $\varphi_3 \in \sum_{m \geq 0,\ n \geq 0} \left(x_3 \mathring{V}_3{}^{m} \mathring{V}_5{}^{n} \varXi + x_4 \mathring{V}_3{}^{m} \mathring{V}_5{}^{n} \varXi + \mathring{V}_3{}^{m} \mathring{V}_5{}^{n} P \right)$ such that

$$x_1^{\mu} x_2^{\nu} v = v' + \varphi_1 + \varphi_2 + \varphi_3$$

by Lemma 4.4. On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} x_1^{\mu} x_2^{\nu} v = x_2^{\nu} x_1^{\mu} v &\in \mathring{V}_5{}^{\nu} \mathring{V}_3{}^{\mu} v + \operatorname{Im}^R(V_3) + \operatorname{Im}^{k[x_2,x_3,x_4]}(V_5) \\ &\subset \mathring{V}_3{}^{\mu} \mathring{V}_5{}^{\nu} v + \sum_{m \geq 0,\ n \geq 0} \left(x_3 \mathring{V}_3{}^{m} \mathring{V}_5{}^{n} \varXi + x_4 \mathring{V}_3{}^{m} \mathring{V}_5{}^{n} \varXi \right) \\ &\qquad + \operatorname{Im}^R(V_3) + \operatorname{Im}^{k[x_2,x_3,x_4]}(V_5) \end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 4.3 and Lemma 4.1, where we have applied the same computation as in (26) to v. Let $\varphi_0 \in \operatorname{Im}^R(V_3) + \operatorname{Im}^{k[x_2,x_3,x_4]}(V_5)$ and $\varphi'_3 \in \sum_{m \geq 0,\ n \geq 0} \left(x_3 \mathring{V}_3{}^{m} \mathring{V}_5{}^{n} \varXi + x_4 \mathring{V}_3{}^{m} \mathring{V}_5{}^{n} \varXi \right)$ be the elements such that $x_1^{\mu} x_2^{\nu} v = \mathring{V}_3{}^{\mu} \mathring{V}_5{}^{\nu} v + \varphi'_3 + \varphi_0$. Then

$$\mathring{V}_3{}^{\mu} \mathring{V}_5{}^{\nu} v - v' - \varphi_3 + \varphi'_3 \in \left(\operatorname{Im}^R(V_3) \oplus \operatorname{Im}^{k[x_2,x_3,x_4]}(V_5) \right) \cap \bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} k[x_3, x_4](d_i + 2).$$

Since the right hand side is the zero module, $\mathring{V}_3{}^{\mu} \mathring{V}_5{}^{\nu} v = v' + \varphi_3 - \varphi'_3$. On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_3 - \varphi'_3 &\in \sum_{m \geq 0,\ n \geq 0} \left(x_3 \mathring{V}_3{}^{m} \mathring{V}_5{}^{n} \varXi + x_4 \mathring{V}_3{}^{m} \mathring{V}_5{}^{n} \varXi + \mathring{V}_3{}^{m} \mathring{V}_5{}^{n} P \right) \\ &\subset \sum_{m \geq 0,\ n \geq 0} \left(x_3 \mathring{V}_3{}^{m} \mathring{V}_5{}^{n} \varXi + x_4 \mathring{V}_3{}^{m} \mathring{V}_5{}^{n} \varXi \right) + \sum_{m \geq 0,\ n \geq 0} L_{m,n} P \end{aligned}$$

by (31). Hence

$$\mathring{V}_3{}^{\mu} \mathring{V}_5{}^{\nu} v \in P_0 + \sum_{m \geq 0,\ n \geq 0} L_{m,n} P + \sum_{m \geq 0,\ n \geq 0} \left(x_3 \mathring{V}_3{}^{m} \mathring{V}_5{}^{n} \varXi + x_4 \mathring{V}_3{}^{m} \mathring{V}_5{}^{n} \varXi \right). \tag{32}$$

Let $M_0 := P_0 + \sum_{m \geq 0,\ n \geq 0} L_{m,n} P$ and $M_1 := \sum_{\mu \geq 0,\ \nu \geq 0} \mathring{V}_3{}^{\mu} \mathring{V}_5{}^{\nu} (P_0 + P)$. By Hamilton-Cayley's theorem, they are finitely generated homogeneous $k[x_3, x_4]$-modules and $M_0 \subset M_1$ by Lemma 4.1 and (30). Since $M_1 \subset M_0 + (x_3, x_4) M_1$ by (30), (31) and (32), we find by Nakayama's lemma that $M_0 = M_1$. □

Corollary 4.7. *In the same situation as in Proposition 4.6, let*

$$v \in \big((x_3, x_4)\operatorname{Im}^R(V_3, V_5) + \operatorname{Im}^R(v_1, \dots, v_\delta)\big) \cap \bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} k[x_3, x_4](d_i + 2).$$

Then

$$\mathring{V}_5{}^\rho v \in P_0 + \sum_{m \geq 0,\ n \geq 0} L_{m,n} P$$

for all $\rho \geq 0$.

Proof. Since $\mathring{V}_5{}^\rho v \in (x_3, x_4)\operatorname{Im}^{k[x_2,x_3,x_4]}(V_5) + x_2^\rho v$ by Lemma 4.3, $\mathring{V}_5{}^\rho v$ is also an element of $\big((x_3, x_4)\operatorname{Im}^R(V_3, V_5) + \operatorname{Im}^R(v_1, \dots, v_\delta)\big) \cap \bigoplus_{i=1}^{Q} k[x_3, x_4](d_i + 2)$. Our assertion follows from this immediately by Corollary 4.5, (30) and Proposition 4.6. ☐

§5. Inequalities coming from the irreducibility of a polynomial of minimal degree

Let X be a curve in $\mathbf{P}^3$, that is, a locally Cohen-Macaulay equidimensional closed subscheme of dimension one of a three dimensional projective space $\mathbf{P}^3$ over an infinite field k. Let further I be the saturated homogeneous ideal of X in a polynomial ring R over k in four indeterminates, $(a; n_1, n_2, \dots, n_a; n_{a+1}, \dots, n_{a+b})$ the basic sequence of X (i.e. the basic sequence of I), and x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 sufficiently general linear forms of R. We have $R = k[x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4]$. Throughout our argument in this section, we will make use of the notation as in Section 1 unless otherwise specified.

Lemma 5.1. *Assume that* $a \geq 3$ *and that* X *is contained in an irreducible surface of degree* a. *Let* ω *and* $t_1, \dots, t_\omega$ *be the integers defined in Sectinon 2 and suppose* $\omega > 2$. *Let* m *be an integer with* $1 \leq m < \omega$, $t := \sum_{l=1}^{m} t_l$, *and* a' *an integer with* $t + 2 \leq a' \leq a$. *Suppose* $n_i = n_t + i - t$ *for all* $t \leq i \leq a'$. *Then there is a Weierstrass basis* $\{e_1^1, e_1^2, \dots, e_a^2, e_1^3, \dots, e_b^3\}$ *of* I *with respect to* x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 *such that the submatrices* U_{01} *and* U_1 *of the standard relation matrix* λ_2 *among* $e_1^1, e_1^2, \dots, e_a^2, e_1^3, \dots, e_b^3$ *defined by* (11) *and* (12) *satisfies*

$$\begin{bmatrix} U_{01} \\ U_1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} * & * & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & * & \dots & * \\ D' & * & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & * & \dots & * \\ 0 & c_t & * & \cdots & \cdots & * & \dots & * \\ 0 & 0 & c_{t+1} & * & \dots & * & \dots & * \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & * & * & \dots & * \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & c_{a'-1} & * & \dots & * \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & * & * & \dots & * \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & * & * & \dots & * \end{bmatrix}, \tag{33}$$

where c_i *is the* $(i+1, i)$ *component of* U_1 *for each* $t \leq i \leq a' - 1$, $c_t, \dots, c_{a'-1} \in k^*$, *and* D' *is a* $t \times (t-1)$ *matrix.*

Proof. There is an irreducible homogeneous polynomial of degree a in I since X is contained in an irreducible surface of degree a by hypothesis. Let ζ_{ij} $(1 \leq i \leq 4,\ 1 \leq j \leq 4)$, z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4, K, R_K and I_K be as in the beginning of Section 2. It is enough to show the corresponding assertion over K for I_K. Let further $\{\tilde{e}_1^1, \tilde{e}_1^2, \ldots, \tilde{e}_a^2, \tilde{e}_1^3, \ldots, \tilde{e}_b^3\}$ be a Weierstrass basis of I_K with respect to z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4 and let $\tilde{\lambda}_2$, $\tilde{U}_{01}$, $\tilde{U}_1$, ω, $t_1, \ldots, t_\omega$, $\tilde{C}_1, \ldots, \tilde{C}_{\omega-1}$, $\tilde{D}_1, \ldots, \tilde{D}_\omega$, and so on also be as in Section 2. By Lemma 2.4, $\tilde{C}_l \neq 0$ for all $1 \leq l < \omega$. Besides, $\omega \geq 3$ and $t_l = 1$ for $m < l < m+a'-t$ by hypothesis. Thererfore $\operatorname{rank}_k(\tilde{C}_l) = 1$ for $m \leq l \leq m + a' - t - 1$, $\tilde{C}_l$ $(m < l < m + a' - t - 1)$ are elements of K^*, and $\tilde{C}_m$ and $\tilde{C}_{m+a'-t-1}$ are a nonzero row and column vectors respectively. Put $\tilde{c}_{l+t-m} := \tilde{C}_l$ for $m < l < m + a' - t - 1$. Let $\tilde{c}_i$ $(a' - 1 \leq i \leq a''' - 1)$ be the components of $\tilde{C}_{m+a'-t-1}$, namely, ${}^t(\tilde{c}_{a'-1}, \ldots, \tilde{c}_{a'''-1}) := \tilde{C}_{m+a'-t-1}$. If $\tilde{c}_{a'-1} = 0$, then there is an i_0 with $a' - 1 < i_0 - 1 \leq a''' - 1$ such that $\tilde{c}_{i_0-1} \neq 0$. Exchanging $\tilde{e}_{a'}^2$ and $\tilde{e}_{i_0}^2$, we obtain another Weierstrass basis $\{\tilde{e}_1^1, \tilde{e}_1^2, \ldots, \tilde{e}_{a'-1}^2, \tilde{e}'^2_{a'}, \tilde{e}_{a'+1}^2, \ldots, \tilde{e}_{i_0-1}^2, \tilde{e}'^2_{i_0}, \tilde{e}_{i_0+1}^2, \ldots, \tilde{e}_a^2, \tilde{e}_1^3, \ldots, \tilde{e}_b^3\}$ $(\tilde{e}'^2_{a'} := \tilde{e}_{i_0}^2,\ \tilde{e}'^2_{i_0} := \tilde{e}_{a'}^2)$ by (iv) of Lemma 1.2, with respect to which the first component of $\tilde{C}_{m+a'-t-1}$ is different from zero. We may therefore assume from the first that $\tilde{c}_{a'-1} \neq 0$. Let $\tilde{G}_m \in GL(t_m, K)$ be as in Lemma 2.5 and let $(0, \ldots, 0, \tilde{c}_t) := \tilde{C}_m \tilde{G}_m$ (i.e. $\tilde{C}''_m = \tilde{c}_t$). Put $t' := \sum_{l=1}^{m-1} t_l$ and

$$(\tilde{e}'^2_{t'+1}, \ldots, \tilde{e}'^2_t) := (\tilde{e}^2_{t'+1}, \ldots, \tilde{e}^2_t)\tilde{G}_m.$$

By (v) of Lemma 1.2 the $\{\tilde{e}_1^1, \tilde{e}_1^2, \ldots, \tilde{e}_{t'}^2, \tilde{e}'^2_{t'+1}, \ldots, \tilde{e}'^2_t, \tilde{e}^2_{t+1}, \ldots, \tilde{e}_a^2, \tilde{e}_1^3, \ldots, \tilde{e}_b^3\}$ is a Weierstrass basis of I_K. Since $(\tilde{e}_1^1, \tilde{e}_1^2, \ldots, \tilde{e}_a^2, \tilde{e}_1^3, \ldots, \tilde{e}_b^3)\tilde{\lambda}_2 = 0$, we have

$$(\tilde{e}_1^1, \tilde{e}_1^2, \ldots, \tilde{e}_{t'}^2, \tilde{e}'^2_{t'+1}, \ldots, \tilde{e}'^2_t, \tilde{e}^2_{t+1}, \ldots, \tilde{e}_a^2, \tilde{e}_1^3, \ldots, \tilde{e}_b^3)\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{G}^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \tilde{\lambda}_2 \tilde{G} = 0 \quad \text{with}$$

$$\tilde{G} := \begin{bmatrix} 1_{t'} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{G}_m & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1_{a+b-t} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let $\tilde{U}'_i$ $(1 \leq i \leq 5)$, $\tilde{U}'_{01}$, $\tilde{U}'_{02}$, $\tilde{U}'_{21}$ and $\tilde{\lambda}'_2$ be the matrices defined by (11) and (12) with respect to this new Weierstrass basis. Then, the above equality implies that

$$\tilde{\lambda}'_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{G}^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \tilde{\lambda}_2 \tilde{G}.$$

Hence, the matrix $\left[\begin{smallmatrix} \tilde{U}'_{01} \\ \tilde{U}'_1 \end{smallmatrix}\right]$ coincides with the right hand side of (33) with tilde attached over c_j and D' by Lemma 2.5. Thus we can choose a desired Weierstrass basis by substituting (ζ_{ij}) with a sufficiently general $\Gamma \in GL(4, k)$. $\square$

Lemma 5.2. *Let the assumption and the notation be as in Lemma 5.1. Then we can choose* $\{e_1^1, e_1^2, \ldots, e_a^2, e_1^3, \ldots, e_b^3\}$ *so that* λ_2 *satisfies*

$$U_{21}\binom{}{1, \ldots, t-1, a', a'+1, \ldots, a} = 0 \tag{34}$$

in addition to (33).

Proof. By Lemma 5.1, there is a a Weierstrass basis $\{e^1_1, e^2_1, \ldots, e^2_a, e^3_1, \ldots, e^3_b\}$ of I with respect to x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 satisfying (33). The condition (34) holds if and only if

$$x_1 e^2_{l'} \in (x_2, x_3, x_4)k[x_2, x_3, x_4]e^1_1 + k[x_2, x_3, x_4]e^2_1 + \cdots + k[x_2, x_3, x_4]e^2_a \tag{35}$$

for all $t-1 < l' < a'$ by the standard method of computing λ_2. We show by an inductive argument that the above Weierstrass basis can be modified so that it also satisfies (35). Let a'' be an integer with $t-1 < a'' < a'$. Suppose that (33) is satisfied and that (35) holds for all $t-1 < l' < a''$. We have

$$x_1 e^2_{a''} = g^1_1 e^1_1 + g^2_1 e^2_1 + \cdots + g^2_a e^2_a + g^3_1 e^3_1 + \cdots + g^3_b e^3_b \tag{36}$$

with $g^1_1 \in (x_2, x_3, x_4)k[x_2, x_3, x_4]$, $g^2_l \in k[x_2, x_3, x_4]$, $g^3_l \in k[x_3, x_4]$. Let a''' denote $\max\{\ i \mid n_i = n_{a'},\ 1 \le i \le a\ \}$. First of all, $g^2_{a''+1} = -c_{a''}$. Besides, $g^2_l = 0$ for $a''+1 < l \le a$ if $a'' < a'-1$, and $g^2_l = 0$ for $a''' < l \le a$ if $a'' = a'-1$, since its degree must be negative. Put $h := -(g^3_1 e^3_1 + \cdots + g^3_b e^3_b)/c_{a''}$ and ${e'}^2_{a''+1} := e^2_{a''+1} + h$. Then the polynomials $e^1_1, e^2_1, \ldots, e^2_{a''}, {e'}^2_{a''+1}, e^2_{a''+2}, \ldots, e^2_a, e^3_1, \ldots, e^3_b$ form a Weierstrass basis of I by (i) of Lemma 1.2. Since

$$x_1 e^2_{a''} = g^1_1 e^1_1 + g^2_1 e^2_1 + \cdots + g^2_{a''+1} {e'}^2_{a''+1} + \cdots + g^2_a e^2_a$$

by (36), this new Weierstrass basis satisfies the condition corresponding to (35) for $l' = a''$. Since $\deg(e^2_l) = n_1 + l - t$ for $t \le l \le a'$, we can reduce (35) to

$$x_1 e^2_{l'} \in (x_2, x_3, x_4)k[x_2, x_3, x_4]e^1_1 + k[x_2, x_3, x_4]e^2_1 + \cdots + k[x_2, x_3, x_4]e^2_{l'+1}$$

for $t-1 < l' < a''$. Moreover

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 e^2_{l'} \in (x_2, x_3, x_4)k[x_2, x_3, x_4]e^1_1 + k[x_2, x_3, x_4]e^2_1 + \cdots + k[x_2, x_3, x_4]e^2_t \\ + k[x_3, x_4]e^3_1 + \cdots + k[x_3, x_4]e^3_b \end{aligned}$$

for $1 \le l' \le t-1$ by (33). No change therefore occurs in the first $a''-1$ columns of λ_2, even though we replace $e^2_{a''+1}$ with ${e'}^2_{a''+1}$. Hence the new Weierstrass basis satisfies the condition corresponding to (35) for all $t-1 < l' \le a''$ with the constants c_j $(t \le j \le a'')$ unchanged in (33), since $g^2_{a''+1} = -c_{a''}$. If $a'' = a'-1$, then we are done. Otherwise, we want to verify also that the constants $c_{a''+1}, \ldots, c_{a'-1}$ do not change at all in the exprssion (33). We have

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 e^2_{a''+1} &= {g'}^1_1 e^1_1 + {g'}^2_1 e^2_1 + \cdots + {g'}^2_a e^2_a + {g'}^3_1 e^3_1 + \cdots + {g'}^3_b e^3_b, \\ x_1 e^2_{l'} &= {g''}^1_1 e^1_1 + {g''}^2_1 e^2_1 + \cdots + {g''}^2_a e^2_a + {g''}^3_1 e^3_1 + \cdots + {g''}^3_b e^3_b \quad (a''+1 < l' < a') \end{aligned}$$

with ${g'}^1_1, {g''}^1_1 \in (x_2, x_3, x_4)k[x_2, x_3, x_4]$, ${g'}^2_l, {g''}^2_l \in k[x_2, x_3, x_4]$, ${g'}^3_l, {g''}^3_l \in k[x_3, x_4]$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 {e'}^2_{a''+1} &= {g'}^1_1 e^1_1 + {g'}^2_1 e^2_1 + \cdots + {g'}^2_{a''+1} {e'}^2_{a''+1} + \cdots + {g'}^2_a e^2_a \\ &\qquad + {g'}^3_1 e^3_1 + \cdots + {g'}^3_b e^3_b + x_1 h - {g'}^2_{a''+1} h, \\ x_1 e^2_{l'} &= {g''}^1_1 e^1_1 + {g''}^2_1 e^2_1 + \cdots + {g''}^2_{a''+1} {e'}^2_{a''+1} + \cdots + {g''}^2_a e^2_a \\ &\qquad + {g''}^3_1 e^3_1 + \cdots + {g''}^3_b e^3_b - {g''}^2_{a''+1} h. \end{aligned}$$

Applying (3) to $\{e^1_1, e^2_1, \ldots, e^2_{a''}, e'^2_{a''+1}, e^2_{a''+2}, \ldots, e^2_a, e^3_1, \ldots, e^3_b\}$, we have

$$x_1 h = f'^1_1 e^1_1 + f'^2_1 e^2_1 + \cdots + f'^2_{a''+1} e'^2_{a''+1} + \cdots + f'^2_a e^2_a + f'^3_1 e^3_1 + \cdots + f'^3_b e^3_b$$

with $f'^1_1, f'^2_l \in (x_3, x_4)k[x_2, x_3, x_4]$, $f'^3_l \in k[x_3, x_4]$. Likewise, applying (3) repeatedly, we see

$$x_2^t h = f'^2_1 e^2_1 + \cdots + f'^2_{a''+1} e'^2_{a''+1} + \cdots + f'^2_a e^2_a + f'^3_1 e^3_1 + \cdots + f'^3_b e^3_b$$

with $f'^2_l \in (x_3, x_4)k[x_2, x_3, x_4]$, $f'^3_l \in k[x_3, x_4]$ for $t > 0$. In the expression of $x_1 e'^2_{a''+1}$ as a standard linear combination of $e^1_1, e^2_1, \ldots, e^2_{a''}, e'^2_{a''+1}, e^2_{a''+2}, \ldots, e^2_a, e^3_1, \ldots, e^3_b$, therefore, the coefficients of $e^1_1, e^2_1, \ldots, e^2_{a''}, e'^2_{a''+1}, e^2_{a''+2}, \ldots, e^2_a$ are congruent to $g'^1_1, g'^2_1, \ldots, g'^2_a$ modulo $(x_3, x_4)k[x_2, x_3, x_4]$. The same holds for the coefficients in the expressions of $x_1 e^2_{l'}$ $(a'' + 1 < l' < a')$. Hence the constants $c_{a''+1}, \ldots, c_{a'-1}$ do not change at all. The zeros appearing in the right hand side of (33) for reasons of degree also do not change at all. Thus, our new Weierstrass basis satisfies (33) and the condition corresponding to (35) for all $t - 1 < l' \leq a''$, with no change in D' and $c_t, \ldots, c_{a'-1}$. We reach our assertion inductively starting with $a'' = t$. □

In exactly the same manner as in the arguments of Lemmas 5.1 and 5.2, one obtains the lemma below.

Lemma 5.3. *Assume that $a \geq 2$ and that X is contained in an irreducible surface of degree a. Let ω and $t_1, \ldots, t_\omega$ be the integers defined in Sectinon 2 and suppose $\omega > 1$. Put $t := \sum_{l=1}^m t_l$ for an integer m with $1 \leq m < \omega$. Suppose $t + 1 \leq a$ and $n_{t+1} = n_t + 1$. Then there is a Weierstrass basis $\{e^1_1, e^2_1, \ldots, e^2_a, e^3_1, \ldots, e^3_b\}$ of I with respect to x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 such that the submatrices U_{01} and U_1 of the standard relation matrix λ_2 among $e^1_1, e^2_1, \ldots, e^2_a, e^3_1, \ldots, e^3_b$ defined by* (11) *and* (12) *satisfies the following conditions:*

$$\begin{bmatrix} U_{01} \\ U_1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} * & * & \cdots\cdots & * \\ D' & * & \cdots\cdots & * \\ 0 & \begin{bmatrix} 1_{t-t''} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} & * \ \ \ldots & * \\ 0 & 0 & * \ \ \ldots & * \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & * \ \ \ldots & * \end{bmatrix}, \quad U_{21}\Big(_{1, \ldots, t'', t+1, t+2, \ldots, a}\Big) = 0, \tag{37}$$

where t'' is the number of the columns of D' and $t'' < t$.

Proof. Let ζ_{ij}, z_i, K, R_K, I_K, $\{\tilde{e}^1_1, \tilde{e}^2_1, \ldots, \tilde{e}^2_a, \tilde{e}^3_1, \ldots, \tilde{e}^3_b\}$, $\tilde{\lambda}_2$, $\tilde{U}_i$ $(1 \leq i \leq 5)$, $\tilde{U}_{01}$, $\tilde{U}_{02}$, $\tilde{U}_{21}$, ω, $t_1, \ldots, t_\omega$, $\tilde{C}_1, \ldots, \tilde{C}_{\omega-1}$, $\tilde{D}_1, \ldots, \tilde{D}_\omega$ be as in the proof of Lemma 5.1. There is an irreducible homogeneous polynomial of degree a in I since X is contained in an irreducible surface of degree a. Let $\tilde{G}_m$, $\tilde{D}'_m$, $\tilde{C}''_m$ be as in Lemma 2.5 and let t''_m denote the number of the columns of $\tilde{C}''_m$ which is equal to its rank. There is a $\tilde{G}'_{m+1} \in GL(t_{m+1}, k)$ such that $\tilde{G}'_{m+1} \tilde{C}''_m = \begin{bmatrix} 1_{t''_m} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$. Besides, $\tilde{G}'_{m+1} \tilde{D}_{m+1} \tilde{G}'^{-1}_{m+1} - z_1 1_{t_{m+1}} \in$ MAT$(K[z_2, z_3, z_4])$. Put $t' := \sum_{l=1}^{m-1} t_l$ and

$$(\tilde{e}'^2_{t'+1}, \ldots, \tilde{e}'^2_t) := (\tilde{e}^2_{t'+1}, \ldots, \tilde{e}^2_t) \tilde{G}_m,$$
$$(\tilde{e}'^2_{t+1}, \ldots, \tilde{e}'^2_{t+t_{m+1}}) := (\tilde{e}^2_{t+1}, \ldots, \tilde{e}^2_{t+t_{m+1}}) \tilde{G}'^{-1}_{m+1}.$$

By (v) of Lemma 1.2 the $\{\tilde{e}^1_1, \tilde{e}^2_1, \dots, \tilde{e}^2_{t'}, \tilde{e}'^2_{t'+1}, \dots, \tilde{e}'^2_{t+t_{m+1}}, \tilde{e}^2_{t+t_{m+1}+1}, \dots, \tilde{e}^2_a, \tilde{e}^3_1, \dots, \tilde{e}^3_b\}$ is a Weierstrass basis of I_K. The remaining part of the proof of our assertion is almost the same as in the proofs of Lemmas 5.1 and 5.2. In the course of that arugument one sees $t''_m = t - t''$. The details are left to the readers. □

Remark 5.4. We can carry out the reasoning in the proof of Lemma 5.2, starting with the Weierstrass basis of I_K obtained in the final stage of the proof of Lemma 5.1. We may therefor assume that the Weierstrass basis of I stated in Lemma 5.2 and its standard relation matrices are obtained from those of I_K with the same properties by the substitution $(\zeta_{ij}) = \Gamma$ for sufficiently general $\Gamma \in GL(4,k)$. The same holds also for the Weierstrass basis stated in Lemma 5.3.

Lemma 5.5. *Let α and β be positive integers with $\alpha \le \beta < a$, j' a positive integer with $\beta + j' \le a$, c_i the $(i+j', i)$ component of U_1 for each $\alpha \le i \le \beta$, and v_i the i-th column of ${}^tU_4$ for each $1 \le i \le a$. Suppose that*

$$U_1 = \begin{bmatrix}
 & \cdots\cdots\cdots\cdots\cdots\cdots & & & & & & & & \\
 & & & & & & & & & \\
0 & \dots & 0 & c_\alpha & * & \multicolumn{2}{c}{\cdots\cdots} & * & \dots & * \\
0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & c_{\alpha+1} & * & \dots & * & \dots & * \\
\vdots & & & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & * & * & \dots & * \\
0 & \multicolumn{3}{c}{\cdots\cdots\cdots} & 0 & 0 & c_\beta & * & \dots & * \\
 & \cdots\cdots\cdots\cdots\cdots\cdots & & & & & & & &
\end{bmatrix}$$

and that $c_i \in k^*$ for all $\alpha \le i \le \beta$. Then

$$v_i \in (x_3, x_4)\,\mathrm{Im}^R({}^tU_3, {}^tU_5) + \mathrm{Im}^R(v_{\beta+1}, \dots, v_a)$$

for all $\alpha \le i \le a$.

Proof. For each $1 \le j \le a$, let h_j (resp. h'_j) denote the j-th row of U_4 (resp. the j-th row of U_2). Likewise let u_{ij} denote the (i,j) component of U_1 for each pair i,j with $1 \le i \le a,\ 1 \le j \le a$. By the equality $\lambda_2\lambda_3 = 0$, we have

$$(U_1, U_2, U_4)\begin{bmatrix} -U_4 \\ -U_5 \\ U_3 \end{bmatrix} = 0.$$

Let i be an integer with $\alpha \le i \le \beta$. Then, from the $(i+j')$-th row of the above equality, we get

$$-c_i h_i - \sum_{j=i+1}^{a} u_{i+j'j} h_j - h'_{i+j'} U_5 + h_{i+j'} U_3 = 0.$$

Transposing both sides of this equality, we obtain

$$-c_i v_i - \sum_{j=i+1}^{a} u_{i+j'j} v_j - {}^tU_5{}^th'_{i+j'} + {}^tU_3{}^th_{i+j'} = 0,$$

as $v_j = {}^t h_j$ for all j. By (10) the components of h_j and h'_j $(1 \le j \le a)$ are contained in $(x_3, x_4)k[x_3, x_4]$ and $(x_3, x_4)k[x_2, x_3, x_4]$ respectively. Hence

$$v_i \in (x_3, x_4)\,\mathrm{Im}^R({}^tU_3, {}^tU_5) + \mathrm{Im}^R(v_{i+1}, \ldots, v_a).$$

Our assertion follows from this by descending induction on i. □

Lemma 5.6. *Let M, E be finitely generated graded modules over R with $M \subset E$ and $v_1, \ldots, v_q$ homogeneos elements of E. Let further $\varPhi = (f_{ij})$ be a $q \times q$ matirx with components in R such that f_{ii} is a homogeneous element of $k[x_2]\backslash\{0\} + (x_3, x_4)R$ for all $1 \le i \le q$, $f_{ij} \in (x_3, x_4)R$ for all i, j with $i < j$, and the degree of $\prod_{i=l}^{q} f_{ii}$ is less than or equal to $q - l + 1$ for all $1 \le l \le q$. Denote by M_0 the $k[x_3, x_4]$-submodule of E generated by $x_2^\rho v_i$ $(1 \le i \le q,\ 0 \le \rho < q - i + 1)$ over $k[x_3, x_4]$. Suppose that every component of $(v_1, \ldots, v_q)\varPhi$ lies in M and that $x_1 v_i \in \mathrm{Im}^{k[x_2,x_3,x_4]}(v_1, \ldots, v_q) + M$ for all $1 \le i \le q$. Then $\mathrm{Im}^R(v_1, \ldots, v_q) \subset M_0 + M$. In particular, $x_i M_0 \in M_0 + M$ for $i = 1, 2$.*

Proof. Let $M_1 := \mathrm{Im}^{k[x_2,x_3,x_4]}(v_1, \ldots, v_q)$. Then $M_0 \subset M_1$. Since $Rv_j \subset M_1 + M$ by the hypothesis that $x_1 v_i$ is an element of $M_1 + M$ for all $1 \le i \le q$, it is enough to show that $M_1 \subset M_0 + M$. For each $1 \le i \le q$, let $\begin{bmatrix} \varPhi''_i \\ \varPhi'_i \end{bmatrix}$ be the last $q - i + 1$ columns of $\varPhi$, where $\varPhi'_i$ is a square matrix. By the assumption on $\varPhi$, the components of $\varPhi''_i$ are elemsnts of $(x_3, x_4)R$ and $\det(\varPhi'_i) \in k^* x_2^{l_i} + (x_3, x_4)R$ with $0 \le l_i \le q - i + 1$. Besides, every component of $(v_1, \ldots, v_q)\begin{bmatrix} \varPhi''_i \\ \varPhi'_i \end{bmatrix}$ lies in M. Multiplying by $\det(\varPhi'_i){\varPhi'_i}^{-1}$ on the right, we obtain $\det(\varPhi'_i)v_i \in \sum_{j=1}^{i-1}(x_3, x_4)Rv_j + M$. Hence $x_2^{q-i+1} v_i \in \sum_{j=1}^{i}(x_3, x_4)Rv_j + M \subset (x_3, x_4)M_1 + M$. Since $x_2^\rho v_i \in M_0$ for $0 \le \rho < q - i + 1$, this implies that $x_2^\rho v_i \in M_0 + (x_3, x_4)M_1 + M$ for all $\rho \ge 0$. This being true for all $1 \le i \le q$, we find that $M_1 + M \subset (M_0 + M) + (x_3, x_4)(M_1 + M)$. Since $[M_1 + M]_l = 0$ for all $l \ll 0$, we get $M_1 + M = M_0 + M$ by Nakayama's lemma. This proves our assertion. □

Theorem 5.7. *Assume $\mathrm{char}(k) = 0$. Suppose that $a \ge 2$, $b \ge 1$ and that X is contained in an irreducible surface of degree a. Let ω and $t_1, \ldots, t_\omega$ be the integers defined in Sectinon 2 and suppose $\omega > 1$. Let m be an integer with $1 \le m < \omega$, $t := \sum_{l=1}^{m} t_l$, and a' be an integer with $t + 1 \le a' \le a$. If $n_i = n_t + i - t$ for all $t \le i \le a'$ and $n_{a+1} < n_{a'}$, then $t(t-1)/2 > p$, where $p := \max\{\ i \mid n_{a+i} < n_{a'},\ 1 \le i \le b\ \}$.*

Proof. To prove our assertion, we use Weierstrass basis of I as stated in Lemmas 5.1 and 5.2 or in Lemma 5.3, according as $a' \ge t + 2$ or $a' = t + 1$.
Case 1. We first consider the case $a' \ge t + 2$. Let $\{e_1^1, e_1^2, \ldots, e_a^2, e_1^3, \ldots, e_b^3\}$ and λ_2 be a Weierstrass basis of I with respect to x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 and its standard relation matrix respectively satisfying the conditions described in Lemmas 5.1 and 5.2. Let further

$$\lambda_3 := \begin{bmatrix} -U_4 \\ -U_5 \\ U_3 \end{bmatrix}$$

and v_j be the j-th column of ${}^tU_4$ for each $1 \le j \le a$. Recall that v_j is an element of $(x_3, x_4)\bigoplus_{i=1}^{b} k[x_3, x_4](n_{a+i} + 2)$ for all $1 \le j \le a$. Let M denote the module

$(x_3, x_4)\operatorname{Im}^R({}^tU_3, {}^tU_5) + \operatorname{Im}^R(v_{a'}, \dots, v_a)$. Since $\lambda_2\lambda_3 = 0$ and the condition (33) holds, it follows from Lemma 5.5 that

$$v_j \in M \tag{38}$$

for all $t \leq j \leq a$. This means $\operatorname{Im}^R(v_t, \dots, v_a) \subset M$. Moreover, $x_1 v_j$ $(1 \leq j \leq a)$ are contained in $(x_3, x_4)\operatorname{Im}^R({}^tU_3, {}^tU_5) + \operatorname{Im}^{k[x_2,x_3,x_4]}(v_1, \dots, v_a)$ by Lemma 1.3. Hence

$$x_1 v_j \in \operatorname{Im}^{k[x_2,x_3,x_4]}(v_1, \dots, v_{t-1}) + M \tag{39}$$

for all $1 \leq j \leq a$. Suppose that $t \geq 2$ for a while. By Lemma 2.8 and Remark 5.4, there are a $a \times (a+1)$ matrix G' with components in $k[x_2]$ and a $G \in GL(t-1, k[x_2])$ such that $(u_{ij}) := G'\left(\left[\begin{smallmatrix} U_{01} \\ U_1 \end{smallmatrix}\right]\left({}_{t,\dots,a}\right)\right)G$ have the properties (i) and (ii) stated there with $q = t-1$. Let $v'_1, \dots, v'_{t-1}$ be the elements of $(x_3, x_4)\bigoplus_{i=1}^b k[x_3, x_4](n_{a+i}+2)$ defined by

$$(v'_1, \dots, v'_{t-1}) := (v_1, \dots, v_{t-1})\,{}^tG^{-1}.$$

First we have $\operatorname{Im}^{k[x_2,x_3,x_4]}(v_1, \dots, v_{t-1}) = \operatorname{Im}^{k[x_2,x_3,x_4]}(v'_1, \dots, v'_{t-1})$. The $x_1 v'_j$ therefore lies in $\operatorname{Im}^{k[x_2,x_3,x_4]}(v'_1, \dots, v'_{t-1}) + M$ for all $1 \leq j \leq t-1$ by (39). We have

$$\left(\begin{bmatrix} G' & 0 \\ 0 & 1_b \end{bmatrix} \lambda_2 \begin{bmatrix} G & 0 \\ 0 & 1_{a+2b-t+1} \end{bmatrix}\right)\left(\begin{bmatrix} G^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 1_{a+2b-t+1} \end{bmatrix} \lambda_3\right) = 0.$$

It follows therefore from the first a rows that

$$\begin{aligned} -\left(G'\left(\begin{bmatrix} U_{01} \\ U_1 \end{bmatrix}\left({}_{t,\dots,a}\right)\right)G\right){}^t(v'_1, \dots, v'_{t-1}) - \left(G'\left(\begin{bmatrix} U_{01} \\ U_1 \end{bmatrix}\left({}_{1,\dots,t-1}\right)\right)\right){}^t(v_t, \dots, v_a) \\ - G'\begin{bmatrix} U_{02} \\ U_2 \end{bmatrix} U_5 + G'\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ U_4 \end{bmatrix} U_3 = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since $(u_{ij}) = G'\left(\left[\begin{smallmatrix} U_{01} \\ U_1 \end{smallmatrix}\right]\left({}_{t,\dots,a}\right)\right)G$ and $\operatorname{Im}^R(v_t, \dots, v_a) \subset M$, we find by transposing the above equality that every component of $(v'_1, \dots, v'_{t_1-1})\varPhi$ lies in M, where $\varPhi$ is the transpose of the square matrix consisting of the last $t-1$ rows of (u_{ij}), namely,

$$\varPhi = \begin{bmatrix} u_{a-t+2\,1} & \cdots & u_{a1} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ u_{a-t+2\,t-1} & \cdots & u_{a\,t-1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Notice that $\varPhi$ satisfies the hypotheses stated in Lemma 5.6 by Lemma 2.8. Let M_0 be the module generated by $x_2^\rho v'_i$ $(1 \leq i \leq t-1,\ 0 \leq \rho < t-i)$ over $k[x_3, x_4]$. Then, with the use of Lemma 5.6, we see $\operatorname{Im}^R(v_1, \dots, v_{t-1}) = \operatorname{Im}^R(v'_1, \dots, v'_{t-1}) \subset M_0 + M$ and $x_i M_0 \subset M_0 + M$ for $i = 1, 2$. For each pair i, ρ with $1 \leq i \leq t-1,\ 0 \leq \rho < t-i$, there is a $\pi_{i,\rho} \in (x_3, x_4)\bigoplus_{i=1}^b k[x_3, x_4](n_{a+i}+2)$ such that

$$x_2^\rho v'_i \in (x_3, x_4)\operatorname{Im}^{k[x_2,x_3,x_4]}({}^tU_5) + \pi_{i,\rho} \tag{40}$$

by Lemma 4.3 with $V_5 = {}^tU_5$, since $x_2^\rho v_i' \in \mathrm{Im}^{k[x_2,x_3,x_4]}(v_1,\dots,v_{t-1})$. Let P_0 (resp. P_1) denote the $k[x_3,x_4]$-module generated by $\pi_{i,\rho}$ $(1 \leq i \leq t-1,\ 0 \leq \rho < t-i)$ (resp. $v_1,\dots,v_{t-1}$). Notice first that $P_0 + M = M_0 + M$ by (40). Hence

$$x_iP_0 \subset P_0 + M$$

for $i = 1, 2$ by what we have just seen. Since each v_l $(1 \leq l \leq t-1)$ is a liniear combination of $v_1',\dots,v_{t-1}'$ over $k[x_2]$ by its definition, it follows from (40) with $\rho = 0$ that there are constants $s_{i\nu} \in k$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} v_l &\equiv \sum_{i\geq 1,\ \nu\geq 0} s_{i\nu}x_2^\nu\pi_{i,0} \pmod{\mathrm{Im}^{k[x_2,x_3,x_4]}({}^tU_5)} \\ &\equiv \sum_{i\geq 1,\ \nu\geq 0} s_{i\nu}({}^t\mathring{U}_5)^\nu\pi_{i,0} \pmod{\mathrm{Im}^{k[x_2,x_3,x_4]}({}^tU_5)} \end{aligned}$$

again by Lemma 4.3. Consequently, $v_l = \sum_{i\geq 1,\ \nu\geq 0} s_{i\nu}({}^t\mathring{U}_5)^\nu\pi_{i,0} \in \sum_{\nu\geq 0}({}^t\mathring{U}_5)^\nu P_0$ for all $1 \leq l \leq t-1$. Hence $P_1 \subset \sum_{\nu\geq 0}({}^t\mathring{U}_5)^\nu P_0$. On the other hand, transposing the relation

$$-U_{21}U_4 - \mathring{U}_3\mathring{U}_5 + \mathring{U}_5\mathring{U}_3 = (U_{21}, U_3, U_5)\begin{bmatrix} -U_4 \\ -U_5 \\ U_3 \end{bmatrix} = 0$$

which follows from $\lambda_2\lambda_3 = 0$, we see that the columns of $[{}^t\mathring{U}_3, {}^t\mathring{U}_5] = {}^t\mathring{U}_3{}^t\mathring{U}_5 - {}^t\mathring{U}_5{}^t\mathring{U}_3$ are contained in the module generated by $v_1,\dots,v_{t-1},v_{a'},\dots,v_a$ over $k[x_3,x_4]$, since $U_{21}\left({}_{1,2,,\dots,t-1,a',a'+1,\dots,a}\right) = 0$. Let $\varXi$ denote the module over $k[x_3,x_4]$ generated by the columns of $[{}^t\mathring{U}_3, {}^t\mathring{U}_5]$ and P the $k[x_3,x_4]$-module generated by $v_{a'},\dots,v_a$. Then, as seen above,

$$\varXi \subset P_1 + P \subset \sum_{\nu\geq 0}({}^t\mathring{U}_5)^\nu P_0 + P.$$

So far we have assumed that $t \geq 2$. In the case where $t = 1$, let P_0 be the zero module. Then, it can be verified directly that $\varXi \subset P = \sum_{\nu\geq 0}({}^t\mathring{U}_5)^\nu P_0 + P$ and that $x_iP_0 \subset P_0 + M$ for $i = 1, 2$. Now, we can apply the results of Section 3 to the present situation with $\mathring{V}_3 = {}^t\mathring{U}_3$, $\mathring{V}_5 = {}^t\mathring{U}_5$, $V_3 = {}^tU_3$, $V_5 = {}^tU_5$, $Q = b$ and $d_i = n_{a+i}$ $(1 \leq i \leq b)$. Since v_j lies in $(x_3,x_4)\bigoplus_{i=1}^b k[x_3,x_4](n_{a+i}+2)$ and satisfies (38) for $t \leq j \leq a$, we find by Corollary 4.7 that

$$({}^t\mathring{U}_5)^\rho v_j \in P_0 + \sum_{m\geq 0,\ n\geq 0} L_{m,n}P \tag{41}$$

for all $\rho \geq 0$ and $t \leq j \leq a$ with

$$L_{m,n} := \sum_{\substack{(p_1,\dots,p_{m+n}) \text{ such that} \\ \#\{i|p_i=3\}=m \text{ and } \#\{i|p_i=5\}=n}} \left(\prod_{j=1}^{m+n} {}^t\mathring{U}_{p_j}\right).$$

This holds also for $1 \le j \le t-1$ by Proposition 4.6, since $v_j \in P_1 \subset \sum_{\nu \ge 0} ({}^t\mathring{U}_5)^\nu P_0$ for this range.

Suppose $n_{a+1} < n_{a'}$ and put $p := \max\{\ i \mid n_{a+i} < n_{a'},\ 1 \le i \le b\ \}$. Then $p \ge 1$. Recall that

$$\operatorname{Ext}^3_R(R/I, R) \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^{b} R(n_{a+i}+2)/\operatorname{Im}^R({}^tU_3, {}^tU_5, v_1, \ldots, v_a)$$

by Lemma 1.3. Since X is locally Cohen-Macaulay by assumption, the length of this module must be finite. Let $N_p := 0^p \oplus \bigoplus_{i=p+1}^{b} k[x_3, x_4](n_{a+i}+2)$. For each $1 \le j \le a$, we have $\deg(v_j) = -1 - n_j$ by our standard method of constructing λ_2. In other words

$$\varDelta(v_j) = {}^t(n_{a+1}+1-n_j, \ldots, n_{a+p}+1-n_j, \ldots, n_{a+b}+1-n_j).$$

Since $n_{a+i}+1 \le n_{a'}$ for $1 \le i \le p$ and since each component of v_j lies in $(x_3, x_4)k[x_3, x_4]$, we see $v_j \in N_p$ for all $a' \le j \le a$. By the maximality of p, three cases are possible: (i) $p = b$, (ii) $p < b$ and $n_{a+p}+1 = n_{a+p+1} = n_{a'}$, (iii) $p < b$ and $n_{a+p}+1 < n_{a+p+1}$. In the case (i), P must be zero since $N_p = N_b = 0$. Hence

$$\operatorname{Ext}^3_R(R/I, R) \cong \left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^{b} k[x_3, x_4](n_{a+i}+2) \right) / P_0$$

by Lemma 1.3 and (41). Since P_0 is generated by $t(t-1)/2$ elements contained in $(x_3, x_4) \bigoplus_{i=1}^{b} k[x_3, x_4](n_{a+i}+2)$ over $k[x_3, x_4]$, the length of $\operatorname{Ext}^3_R(R/I, R)$ cannot be finite if $t(t-1)/2 \le b = p$. Hence $t(t-1)/2 > p$. We next consider the case (ii). Let $q' := \max\{\ i \mid n_{a+p-i+1} = \cdots = n_{a+p-1} = n_{a+p}\ \}$. Since the basic sequence $(a; n_1, \ldots, n_a; n_{a+1}, \ldots, n_{a+b})$ is an invariant of X, which does not vary under any sufficiently general homogeneous transformation of variables, the presentation of the module $\operatorname{Ext}^3_R(R/I, R)$ described in Lemma 1.3 holds for all sufficiently general x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4. The number of the minimal generators of the $k[x_3, x_4]$-module $\operatorname{Ext}^3_R(R/I, R)$ of degree $-1 - n_{a+p+1}$ is therefore q', and remains unchanged for any small homogeneous transformation of variables x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4. For each j with $a' \le j \le a$, let $v''_j := x_3^{n_j - n_{a+p+1}} v_j$. Then $\deg(v''_j) = -1 - n_{a+p+1}$ and $v''_j \in [N_p]_{-1-n_{a+p+1}} \cap \operatorname{Im}^{k[x_3,x_4]}(v_1, \ldots, v_a)$, since $\deg(v_j) = -1 - n_j$ and $v_j \in N_p$ for all $a' \le j \le a$. We find thererfore by Lemma 3.2 and the case (ii) of Lemma 3.3 that

$$({}^t\mathring{U}_3 + s\,{}^t\mathring{U}_5)^\nu v''_j \in N_p$$

for all $\nu \ge 0$ and all $s \in k$. Taking the coefficient of s^n in the expansion of the above relation with $\nu = m + n$, we obtain $L_{m,n} v''_j \in N_p$. Hence $L_{m,n} v_j \in N_p$ for all $a' \le j \le a$, $m \ge 0$, and $n \ge 0$. Thus

$$\sum_{m \ge 0,\ n \ge 0} L_{m,n} P \subset N_p. \tag{42}$$

Let $\mathrm{pr} : \bigoplus_{i=1}^{b} k[x_3, x_4](n_{a+i} + 2) \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{i=1}^{p} k[x_3, x_4](n_{a+i} + 2)$ be the natural projection to the first p components. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
& l_{k[x_3,x_4]}(\mathrm{Ext}^3_R(R/I, R)) \\
&\quad = l_{k[x_3,x_4]} \left(\left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^{b} k[x_3, x_4](n_{a+i} + 2) \right) / \left(\sum_{\rho=0}^{b-1} \mathrm{Im}^{k[x_3,x_4]}(({}^t\mathring{U}_5)^\rho \cdot {}^tU_4) \right) \right) \\
&\quad \geq l_{k[x_3,x_4]} \left(\left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^{p} k[x_3, x_4](n_{a+i} + 2) \right) /\mathrm{pr} \left(\sum_{\rho=0}^{b-1} \mathrm{Im}^{k[x_3,x_4]}(({}^t\mathring{U}_5)^\rho \cdot {}^tU_4) \right) \right) \\
&\quad \geq l_{k[x_3,x_4]} \left(\left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^{p} k[x_3, x_4](n_{a+i} + 2) \right) /\mathrm{pr}(P_0) \right)
\end{aligned}$$

by (41) and (42). This length cannot be finite if $t(t-1)/2 \leq p$, since P_0 is generated by $t(t-1)/2$ elements contained in $(x_3, x_4) \bigoplus_{i=1}^{b} k[x_3, x_4](n_{a+i} + 2)$ over $k[x_3, x_4]$. Hence $t(t-1)/2 > p$. In the remaining case (iii), we can obtain (42) in the same way as above by Lemma 3.2 and the case (i) of Lemma 3.3, and reach our assertion.

Case 2. In the case $a' = t + 1$, we make use of a Weierstrass basis stated in Lemma 5.3 and can argue in exactly the same manner as above to obtain $t''(t''+1)/2 > p$ if $n_{a+1} < n_{a'}$. Since $t'' \leq t - 1$, this implies $t(t-1)/2 > p$. □

Corollary 5.8. *Assume* $\mathrm{char}(k) = 0$. *Suppose that X is contained in an irreducible surface of degree $a \geq 2$ and that $b \geq 1$. Let a' be an integer with $2 \leq a' \leq a$. Then $n_{a+1} \geq n_{a'}$, if*

(i) *$n_i = n_1 + i - 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq a'$, or*

(ii) *$a' \geq 3$ and $n_i = n_1 + i - 2$ for all $2 \leq i \leq a'$.*

Proof. Suppose that $n_{a+1} < n_{a'}$. We use Theorem 5.7 with $m = 1$. Then $t = t_1$ and $p \geq 1$. If $n_i = n_1 + i - 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq a'$, then $t_1 = 1$ and $0 = t_1(t_1 - 1)/2 > p \geq 1$ by Theorem 5.7. Likewise if $a' \geq 3$ and $n_i = n_1 + i - 2$ for all $2 \leq i \leq a'$, then $t_1 = 2$ and $1 = t_1(t_1 - 1)/2 > p \geq 1$. Thus we are led to a contadiction. □

In the remaining part of this section, we describe other miscellaneous results that can be proved using the existence of an irreducible homogeneous polynomial of minimal degree.

Lemma 5.9. *Assume that $a \geq 2$ and that X is contained in an irreducible surface of degree a. Suppose $n_i = n_1 + i - 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq a$. Then, there is a Weierstrass basis $\{e^1_1, e^2_1, \ldots, e^2_a, e^3_1, \ldots, e^3_b\}$ of I with respect to x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 such that $U_{21} = 0$. Moreover, it also have the properties stated in Lemmas 5.1 and 5.2 or in Lemma 5.3 with $m = t = 1$.*

Proof. Let $\{e^1_1, e^2_1, \ldots, e^2_a, e^3_1, \ldots, e^3_b\}$ be the Weierstrass basis of I stated in Lemmas 5.1 and 5.2 with $m = t = 1$ for $a \geq 3$, or in Lemma 5.3 with $m = t = 1$ for $a = 2$. Denote by J the ideal $(e^1_1, e^2_1) \subset R$. Then,

$$U_{21}\Big({}_{a}\Big) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{rank}_k \left(U_1\Big({}_{a}\Big) \pmod{(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)} \right) = a - 1.$$

These equalities imply that $e^2_2, \ldots, e^2_a \in J$, since $(e^1_1, e^2_1, \ldots, e^2_a, e^3_1, \ldots, e^3_b)\lambda_2 = 0$. Hence $J = (e^1_1, e^2_1, \ldots, e^2_a)$. We have $n_{a+1} \geq n_a$ by Corollary 5.8 and $a \leq n_1 < n_2 < \cdots < n_a$ by hypothesis, so that $[J]_a = [I]_a$. Since there is no unit in the first two rows of λ_2, the ideal J is minimally generated by e^1_1 and e^2_1. Besides, $[I]_a$ contains an irreducible polynomial by hypothesis. Consequently, J must be a complete intersection of two homogeneous polynomials of of degree a and n_1. Moreover

$$I' := Re^1_1 + \left(\sum_{l=1}^{a} k[x_2, x_3, x_4]e^2_l\right) = Re^1_1 \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{l=1}^{a} k[x_2, x_3, x_4]e^2_l\right) \subset J,$$

where I' is considered as a $k[x_2, x_3, x_4]$-module here. Since $n_l = n_1 + l - 1$ by hypothesis, it follows from the above equality that

$$\dim_k([I']_t) = \binom{t-a+3}{3}_+ + \sum_{l=1}^{a} \binom{t-n_1-l+3}{2}_+$$

for $t \in \mathbf{Z}$. Here, given integers μ and ν, $\binom{\mu}{\nu}_+ := \mu!/(\mu-\nu)!\nu!$ if $\mu \geq \nu \geq 0$ and $\binom{\mu}{\nu}_+ := 0$ otherewise. Similarly, we see

$$\dim_k([J]_t) = \binom{t-a+3}{3}_+ + \sum_{l=1}^{a} \binom{t-n_1-l+3}{2}_+$$

for $t \in \mathbf{Z}$, since the basic sequence of J is $(a; n_1, n_1+1, \ldots, n_1+a-1)$ by Lemma 1.4. Hence the subset I' coincides with the ideal J. This implies that $x_1e^2_a \in J = I'$, therefore

$$x_1e^2_a = g^1_1e^1_1 + \sum_{l=1}^{a} g^2_l e^2_l$$

with some $g^1_1 \in R$, $g^2_l \in k[x_2, x_3, x_4]$ $(1 \leq l \leq a)$. Thus the last column of U_{21} must also be zero, which proves our assertion. □

Lemma 5.10. *Let*

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \varphi_1 \\ \varphi_2 & \varphi_3 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \psi_1 \\ \psi_2 & \psi_3 \end{bmatrix}$$

be matrices with entries in $k[x_3, x_4]$ such that $[A, B] = 0$. Suppose that φ_i $(1 \leq i \leq 3)$ and ψ_i $(1 \leq i \leq 3)$ are homogeneous with $\deg \varphi_1 = \deg \psi_1 \leq \deg \varphi_3 = \deg \psi_3 = 1 \leq \deg \varphi_2 = \deg \psi_2$, $\deg \varphi_1 - \deg \varphi_3 = \deg \varphi_3 - \deg \varphi_2$. *Then, there are φ, $\psi \in k[x_3, x_4]$ and a 2×2 matrix C with homogeneous entries in $k[x_3, x_4]$ such that $A = \varphi C$ and $B = \psi C$.*

Proof. By the hypothesis $[A, B] = 0$, we have a system of equations

$$\begin{cases} \varphi_1\psi_2 - \varphi_2\psi_1 = 0 \\ \varphi_2\psi_3 - \varphi_3\psi_2 = 0 \\ \varphi_3\psi_1 - \varphi_1\psi_3 = 0 \end{cases}$$

which is symmetric with respect to the permutation of $\{1, 2, 3\}$.
Case 1. We consider first the case where $\deg \varphi_i = \deg \psi_i = 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq 3$. Suppose $\gcd(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) = 1$. Then $(\psi_1, \psi_2) = c(\varphi_1, \varphi_2)$ with some $c \in k$ and the equations $\varphi_3(c\varphi_1) - \varphi_1\psi_3 = 0$ and $\varphi_2\psi_3 - \varphi_3(c\varphi_2) = 0$ imply $\psi_3 = c\varphi_3$. Hence $B = cA$. Suppose $\gcd(\varphi_1, \varphi_3) = 1$ or $\gcd(\varphi_2, \varphi_3) = 1$. Then in the same way as above, we see $B = cA$ with some $c \in k$. Suppose next that $\varphi_1 \neq 0$, $\varphi_2 = c_2\varphi_1$, $\varphi_3 = c_3\varphi_1$ with $c_2,\ c_3 \in k$. Then the equations $\varphi_1\psi_2 - (c_2\varphi_1)\psi_1 = 0$ and $(c_3\varphi_1)\psi_1 - \varphi_1\psi_3 = 0$ imply $\psi_2 = c_2\psi_1$ and $\psi_3 = c_3\psi_1$ and we get

$$A = \varphi_1 \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ c_2 & c_3 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad B = \psi_1 \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ c_2 & c_3 \end{bmatrix}.$$

If $\varphi_2 \neq 0$, $\varphi_1 = c_1\varphi_2$, $\varphi_3 = c_3\varphi_2$ with $c_1,\ c_3 \in k$, or $\varphi_3 \neq 0$, $\varphi_2 = c_2\varphi_3$, $\varphi_1 = c_1\varphi_3$ with $c_2,\ c_1 \in k$, then we obtain similar expressions as above. Finally, if $\varphi_1 = \varphi_2 = \varphi_3 = 0$, then $A = 0B$.
Case 2. Next we consider the case $\deg \varphi_1 = \deg \psi_1 < \deg \varphi_3 = \deg \psi_3 = 1 < \deg \varphi_2 = \deg \psi_2$. Suppose $\varphi_1 \neq 0$. Then φ_1 must be an element of k, so that $\psi_3 = (\psi_1/\varphi_1)\varphi_3$, $\psi_2 = (\psi_1/\varphi_1)\varphi_2$. Hence $B = (\psi_1/\varphi_1)A$. In the same way, $A = (\varphi_1/\psi_1)B$ if $\psi_1 \neq 0$. Suppose $\varphi_1 = \psi_1 = 0$. Then (φ_2, φ_3) and (ψ_2, ψ_3) are proportional. Hence $A = \varphi C$ and $B = \psi C$ with some 2×2 matrix C with homogeneous entries in $k[x_3, x_4]$ and $\varphi,\ \psi \in k[x_3, x_4]$. ☐

Proposition 5.11. *Suppose that X is contained in an irreducible surface of degree a and that $b > 0$. Suppose further that $n_i = n_1 + i - 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq a$. Then $b > 2$. Moreover, if there is an integer b_0 with $0 < b_0 < b$ such that $n_{a+b_0} + 1 < n_{a+b_0+1}$, then $b_0 > 2$.*

Proof. We use the Weierstrass basis stated in Lemma 5.9. Let v_j be the j-th column of ${}^tU_4$ for each $1 \leq j \leq a$, P the $k[x_3, x_4]$-module generated by v_a, and $\varXi$ the module over $k[x_3, x_4]$ generated by the columns of $[{}^t\mathring{U}_3, {}^t\mathring{U}_5]$. Since $U_{21} = 0$, it follows from the relation $\lambda_2\lambda_3 = 0$ that $[{}^tU_3, {}^tU_5] = [{}^t\mathring{U}_3, {}^t\mathring{U}_5] = [{}^tU_3, {}^t\mathring{U}_5] = 0$ and that $\varXi = 0$. Besides, $v_j \in (x_3, x_4)\operatorname{Im}^R({}^tU_3, {}^tU_5) + \operatorname{Im}^R(v_a)$ for all $1 \leq j \leq a$ as in (38) by Lemma 5.5. Hence $({}^t\mathring{U}_5)^\rho v_j \in (x_3, x_4)\operatorname{Im}^R({}^tU_3, {}^tU_5) + \operatorname{Im}^R(({}^t\mathring{U}_5)^\rho v_a)$. Since $x_1^\mu x_2^\nu ({}^t\mathring{U}_5)^\rho v_a \equiv ({}^t\mathring{U}_3)^\mu ({}^t\mathring{U}_5)^\nu ({}^t\mathring{U}_5)^\rho v_a = ({}^t\mathring{U}_3)^\mu ({}^t\mathring{U}_5)^{\nu+\rho} v_a$ modulo $(x_3, x_4)\operatorname{Im}^R({}^tU_3, {}^tU_5)$ for all $\mu \geq 0$, $\nu \geq 0$ by Lemma 4.3, there is a $\varphi \in \sum_{m \geq 0,\ n \geq 0} ({}^t\mathring{U}_3)^m ({}^t\mathring{U}_5)^n P$ such that $({}^t\mathring{U}_5)^\rho v_j \equiv \varphi$ modulo $(x_3, x_4)\operatorname{Im}^R({}^tU_3, {}^tU_5)$. We find therefore by Corollary 4.5 that $({}^t\mathring{U}_5)^\rho v_j - \varphi \in \sum_{m \geq 0,\ n \geq 0} ({}^t\mathring{U}_3)^m ({}^t\mathring{U}_5)^n P$. Hence

$$({}^t\mathring{U}_5)^\rho v_j \in \sum_{m \geq 0,\ n \geq 0} k[x_3, x_4] ({}^t\mathring{U}_3)^m ({}^t\mathring{U}_5)^n v_a \tag{43}$$

for all $\rho \geq 0$ and $1 \leq j \leq a$. Let b' denote b_0 if there is a b_0 with $0 < b_0 < b$ such that $n_{a+b_0} + 1 < n_{a+b_0+1}$, otherwise let $b' := b$. Then, there are $b' \times b'$ matrices $\mathring{U}'_3$ and $\mathring{U}'_5$ with homogeneous components in $k[x_3, x_4]$ such that

$${}^t\mathring{U}_3 = \begin{bmatrix} {}^t\mathring{U}'_3 & 0 \\ * & * \end{bmatrix}, \quad {}^t\mathring{U}_5 = \begin{bmatrix} {}^t\mathring{U}'_5 & 0 \\ * & * \end{bmatrix}$$

for reasons of the degrees of the components. Notice that $[{}^t\mathring{U}'_3, {}^t\mathring{U}'_5] = 0$. Let pr : $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{b} k[x_3, x_4](n_{a+i} + 2) \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{i=1}^{b'} k[x_3, x_4](n_{a+i} + 2)$ be the natural projection to the first b' components, $v'_j := \mathrm{pr}(v_j)$ $(1 \le j \le a)$ and ${}^tU'_4 := (v'_1, \dots, v'_a)$. Then

$$l_R(\mathrm{Ext}^3_R(R/I, R)) \ge l_{k[x_3,x_4]}\left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^{b'} k[x_3, x_4](n_{a+i} + 2)/\sum_{\rho \ge 0} \mathrm{Im}^{k[x_3,x_4]}({}^t\mathring{U}'_5)^{\rho} \cdot {}^tU'_4)\right) \quad (44)$$

by Lemma 1.3. Suppose $b' = 1$ or $b' = 2$. When $b' = 1$, the matrices ${}^t\mathring{U}'_3$ and ${}^t\mathring{U}'_5$ are just elements of $k[x_3, x_4]$, so that

$${}^t\mathring{U}_5'^{\rho} v'_j \in \sum_{m \ge 0,\ n \ge 0} k[x_3, x_4]({}^t\mathring{U}'_5)^m ({}^t\mathring{U}'_3)^n v'_a \subset k[x_3, x_4]v'_a$$

by (43). Since v'_a is also merely an element of $(x_3, x_4)k[x_3, x_4]$, the length of $\mathrm{Ext}^3_R(R/I, R)$ must be infinite by (44), which is a contradiction. When $b' = 2$, let

$${}^t\mathring{U}^\natural_3 := g_1 1_2 - {}^t\mathring{U}'_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \varphi_1 \\ \varphi_2 & \varphi_3 \end{bmatrix}, \quad {}^t\mathring{U}^\natural_5 := g_2 1_2 - {}^t\mathring{U}'_5 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \psi_1 \\ \psi_2 & \psi_3 \end{bmatrix},$$

where g_1 (resp. g_2) denotes the $(1, 1)$ component of $\mathring{U}'_3$ (resp. $\mathring{U}'_5$). Since the degrees of the entries of $\mathring{U}^\natural_3$ and $\mathring{U}^\natural_5$ are determined by n_{a+1} and n_{a+2}, one sees that φ_i $(1 \le i \le 3)$ and ψ_i $(1 \le i \le 3)$ are homogeneous elements of $k[x_3, x_4]$ such that $\deg \varphi_i = \deg \psi_j = 1$ for all i, j or $\deg \varphi_1 = \deg \psi_1 < \deg \varphi_3 = \deg \psi_3 = 1 < \deg \varphi_2 = \deg \psi_2$, $\deg \varphi_1 - \deg \varphi_3 = \deg \varphi_3 - \deg \varphi_2$. Moreover, $[{}^t\mathring{U}^\natural_3, {}^t\mathring{U}^\natural_5] = 0$ by $[{}^t\mathring{U}'_3, {}^t\mathring{U}'_5] = 0$. By Lemma 5.10, there are $\varphi,\ \psi \in k[x_3, x_4]$ and a 2×2 matrix C with homogeneous entries in $k[x_3, x_4]$ such that ${}^t\mathring{U}^\natural_3 = \varphi C$ and ${}^t\mathring{U}^\natural_5 = \psi C$. We find therefore

$$\begin{aligned}({}^t\mathring{U}'_5)^\rho v'_j &\in \sum_{m \ge 0,\ n \ge 0} k[x_3, x_4]({}^t\mathring{U}'_3)^m ({}^t\mathring{U}'_5)^n v'_a \\ &= \sum_{m \ge 0,\ n \ge 0} k[x_3, x_4](g_1 1_2 - {}^t\mathring{U}^\natural_3)^m (g_2 1_2 - {}^t\mathring{U}^\natural_5)^n v'_a \\ &\subset \sum_{m \ge 0,\ n \ge 0} k[x_3, x_4]({}^t\mathring{U}^\natural_3)^m ({}^t\mathring{U}^\natural_5)^n v'_a \subset \sum_{m \ge 0,\ n \ge 0} k[x_3, x_4]C^{m+n} v'_a \\ &= k[x_3, x_4]v'_a + k[x_3, x_4]Cv'_a\end{aligned}$$

for all $\rho \ge 0$ and $1 \le j \le a$ by (43) and Hamilton-Cayley's formula. Since the components of v'_a lie in $(x_3, x_4)k[x_3, x_4]$, the length of $\mathrm{Ext}^3_R(R/I, R)$ must be infinite by (44). In any case we are let to a contradiction. Thus $b' > 2$. ☐

Proposition 5.12. *Suppose that* X *is contained in an irreducible surface of degree* a *and that* $b > 1$. *Suppose further that* $n_i = n_1 + i - 1$ *for all* $1 \le i \le a$. *Then,* $n_{a+j} \ne n_{a+1} + j - 1$ *for some* $1 \le j \le b$. *Moreover, if there is an integer* b_0 *with* $1 < b_0 < b$ *such that* $n_{a+b_0} + 1 < n_{a+b_0+1}$, *then* $n_{a+j} \ne n_{a+1} + j - 1$ *for some* $1 \le j \le b_0$.

Proof. We use the Weierstrass basis and the standard relation matrix λ_2 stated in Lemma 5.9. Let b'' denote b_0 if there is a b_0 with $0 < b_0 < b$ such that $n_{a+b_0}+1 < n_{a+b_0+1}$, otherwise let $b'' := b$. Then, there are $b'' \times b''$ matrices U_3'' and U_5'' with homogeneous components in R such that

$$
{}^tU_3 = \begin{bmatrix} {}^tU_3'' & 0 \\ * & * \end{bmatrix}, \quad {}^tU_5 = \begin{bmatrix} {}^tU_5'' & 0 \\ * & * \end{bmatrix}
$$

for reasons of the degrees of the components. Suppose that $n_{a+j} = n_{a+1} + j - 1$ for all $1 \le j \le b''$. Let b' be the minimum of j $(1 \le j < b'')$ such that the $(j, j+1)$ components of ${}^tU_3''$ and ${}^tU_5''$ are both zero. In case there is no such j, let $b' := b''$. Since a unit can appear only as a $(j, j+1)$ component $(1 \le j < b'')$ in ${}^tU_3''$ and ${}^tU_5''$, one has

$$
{}^tU_3''\binom{b'+1,\dots,b''}{1,2,\dots,b'} = {}^tU_5''\binom{b'+1,\dots,b''}{1,2,\dots,b'} = 0 \quad \text{and}
$$

$$
\operatorname{rank}_k\left({}^tU_3''\binom{b'+1,\dots,b''}{b'+1,\dots,b''} + s\,{}^tU_5''\binom{b'+1,\dots,b''}{b'+1,\dots,b''}\right) \pmod{(x_1,x_2,x_3,x_4)} \; = b'-1
$$

for some $s \in k$. Put ${}^tU_3' := {}^tU_3''\binom{b'+1,\dots,b''}{b'+1,\dots,b''}$ and ${}^tU_5' := {}^tU_5''\binom{b'+1,\dots,b''}{b'+1,\dots,b''}$. Then, they are $b' \times b'$ matrices with homogeneous components in R such that

$$
{}^tU_3 = \begin{bmatrix} {}^tU_3' & 0 \\ * & * \end{bmatrix}, \quad {}^tU_5 = \begin{bmatrix} {}^tU_5' & 0 \\ * & * \end{bmatrix},
$$

$$
\operatorname{rank}_k({}^tU_3' + s\,{}^tU_5') \pmod{(x_1,x_2,x_3,x_4)} \; = b'-1. \tag{45}
$$

Since $U_{21} = 0$, one has $[{}^tU_3, {}^tU_5] = 0$, so that $[{}^tU_3', {}^tU_5'] = [{}^tU_3' + s\,{}^tU_5', {}^tU_5'] = 0$. Taking the degrees of the components into account, one sees that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{Im}^R({}^tU_3', {}^tU_5') &= \operatorname{Im}^R({}^tU_3' + s\,{}^tU_5', {}^tU_5') \\
&= \operatorname{Im}^R\left({}^tU_3' + s\,{}^tU_5', {}^tU_5'\binom{}{1,2,\dots,b'-1}\right).
\end{aligned}
$$

On the other hand, since the j-th column v_j of ${}^tU_4$ is contained in $(x_3,x_4)\operatorname{Im}^R({}^tU_3, {}^tU_5) + \operatorname{Im}^R(v_a)$ for all $1 \le j \le a$ by Lemma 5.5, one has $\operatorname{Im}^R({}^tU_3, {}^tU_5, {}^tU_4) = \operatorname{Im}^R({}^tU_3, {}^tU_5, v_a)$. Let $\operatorname{pr} : \bigoplus_{i=1}^{b} k[x_3,x_4](n_{a+i}+2) \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{i=1}^{b'} k[x_3,x_4](n_{a+i}+2)$ be the natural projection to the first b' components, $v_j' := \operatorname{pr}(v_j)$ $(1 \le j \le a)$ and ${}^tU_4' := (v_1', \dots, v_a')$, where ${}^tU_4 = (v_1, \dots, v_a)$. Then, by what we have seen,

$$
\operatorname{pr}(\operatorname{Im}^R({}^tU_3, {}^tU_5, {}^tU_4)) = \operatorname{Im}^R\left({}^tU_3' + s\,{}^tU_5', {}^tU_5'\binom{}{1,2,\dots,b'-1}, v_a'\right).
$$

By (45), therefore,

$$
\operatorname{pr}(\operatorname{Coker}^R({}^tU_3, {}^tU_5, {}^tU_4)) \cong R/(g, g', g'')
$$

with suitable homogeneous polynomials g, g', g''. Since the length of this module is infinite and since

$$
\begin{aligned}
l_R(\operatorname{Ext}^3_R(R/I, R)) &= l_R(\operatorname{Coker}^R({}^tU_3, {}^tU_5, {}^tU_4)) \\
&\ge l_R(\operatorname{pr}(\operatorname{Coker}^R({}^tU_3, {}^tU_5, {}^tU_4))),
\end{aligned}
$$

we are led to a contradiction. Hence $n_{a+j} \ne n_{a+1} + j - 1$ for some $1 \le j \le b''$. This proves our assertion. $\square$

§6. The case $b = 1$

Let the notation be the same as in Section 5. We can give a fairly precise characterization of the basic sequences of integral curves with $b = 1$.

Lemma 6.1. *Assume that $b = 1$ and that X does not contain any line as an irreducible component. Let $g_1 := U_3$, $g_2 := U_5$. Then*

$$\operatorname{rank}_{R/(g_1,g_2)}\left(\begin{bmatrix} U_{01} \\ U_1 \\ U_{21} \end{bmatrix} \pmod{(g_1, g_2)}\right) \geq a - 1.$$

Proof. Let $\{e_1^1, e_1^2, \ldots, e_a^2, e_1^3\}$ be a Weierstrass basis of I with respect to x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 and let λ_1 and λ_2 be as in Section 1. Let pt be a point of $\mathbf{P}^3$. Since X is locally Cohen-Macaulay, the ideal sheaf $\mathcal{I}_X$ of X has a free resolution

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_X^{a+1}|_{\mathcal{W}} \xrightarrow{\bar{\lambda}} \mathcal{O}_X^{a+2}|_{\mathcal{W}} \xrightarrow{\lambda_1} \mathcal{I}_X|_{\mathcal{W}} \longrightarrow 0$$

on a neighborhood $\mathcal{W}$ of pt, where $\bar{\lambda}$ is a matrix obtained from λ_2 by deleting one column. By Hilbert-Burch theorem, each e_l^i is an $(a+1) \times (a+1)$ minor of the $(a+2) \times (a+1)$ matrix $\bar{\lambda}$ on $\mathcal{W}$. If our assertion did not hold, then

$$\operatorname{rank}_{R/(g_1,g_2)}(\ \lambda_2 \pmod{(g_1, g_2)}\ ) < a + 1.$$

This would mean that $e_l^i \equiv 0 \pmod{(g_1, g_2)}$ for all $i,\ l$, i.e. $\mathcal{I}_X \subset (g_1, g_2)\mathcal{O}_X$, contradicting the assumption that X does not contain any line as an irreducible component. $\square$

Lemma 6.2. *Assume that $b = 1$ and that X is contained in an irreducible surface of degree a. Let $(v_1, \ldots, v_a) := {}^tU_4$, $p_i := \deg(v_i) = n_{a+1} + 1 - n_i$ $(1 \leq i \leq a)$, and*

$$0 \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{j=1}^{a-1} k[x_3, x_4](-q_j) \xrightarrow{F} \bigoplus_{i=1}^{a} k[x_3, x_4](-p_i) \xrightarrow{{}^tU_4} \mathfrak{a} \longrightarrow 0 \tag{46}$$

a free resolution of $\mathfrak{a} := \operatorname{Im}^{k[x_3,x_4]}({}^tU_4)$, where $p_1 \geq p_2 \geq \cdots \geq p_a$ and $q_1, \ldots, q_{a-1}$ are suitable integers with $q_1 \geq q_2 \geq \cdots \geq q_{a-1}$. Let further $n'_1, \ldots, n'_\omega$ $(\omega \geq 1)$ be a strictly increasing sequence of integers such that $\{n'_1, \ldots, n'_\omega\} = \{\ n_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq a\ \}$ and let $i_\gamma := \min\{\ i \mid n_i = n'_\gamma,\ 1 \leq i \leq a\ \}$ for each $1 \leq \gamma \leq \omega$. Denote by Δ_F (resp. Δ_{U_1}) the $a \times (a-1)$ matrix (resp. $a \times a$ matrix) whose (i, j) component is $q_j - p_i$ (resp. $n_j + 1 - n_i$). Then, for each γ $(2 \leq \gamma \leq \omega)$, there is a j_γ $(1 \leq j_\gamma \leq a - 1)$ such that the transpose of the j_γ-th column of Δ_F coincides with the i_γ-th row of Δ_{U_1}.

Proof. Let $g_1 := U_3$, $g_2 := U_5$. Since g_1 and g_2 are linear forms with $g_1 - x_1, g_2 - x_2 \in k[x_3, x_4]$, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} &U_{01} = g_2U'_{01} + U''_{01}, \quad U_1 = g_1 1_a + g_2U'_1 + U''_1, \\ &\text{with} \quad U'_{01},\ U'_1 \in \mathrm{MAT}(k[x_2, x_3, x_4]), \quad U''_{01},\ U''_1 \in \mathrm{MAT}(k[x_3, x_4]). \end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

Let γ be an integer with $2 \leq \gamma \leq \omega$. By Lemma 2.4, there must exist an integer i'_γ $(1 \leq i'_\gamma \leq a)$ with $n_{i'_\gamma} = n_{i_\gamma} = n'_\gamma$ such that the i'_γ-th row of U_1 contains a unit. Since the unit of U_1 lies in U_1'', this means that the i'_γ-th row of U_1'' contains a unit. On the other hand, it follows from the relation $\lambda_2\lambda_3 = 0$ that $U_1''U_4 = 0$, i.e. ${}^tU_4{}^tU_1'' = 0$. The i'_γ-th column of ${}^tU_1''$ is therefore a linear combination over $k[x_3, x_4]$ of the columns of F by (46). Since the i'_γ-th row contains a unit, this implies that there is a j_γ $(1 \leq j_\gamma \leq a-1)$ such that the j_γ-th column of F contains a unit. Consequently, the j_γ-th column of Δ_F coincides with the i'_γ-th column of $\mathit{\Delta}({}^tU_1'') = \mathit{\Delta}({}^tU_1) = {}^t\Delta_{U_1}$. Hence the transpose of the j_γ-th column of Δ_F coincides with the i'_γ-th row of Δ_{U_1}. Besides, the i_γ-th row and the i'_γ-th row of Δ_{U_1} are the same. Thus the transpose of the j_γ-th column of Δ_F coincides with the i_γ-th row of Δ_{U_1}. ☐

Lemma 6.3. *Assume that $b = 1$, X is contained in an irreducible surface of degree a, and that X does not contain any line as an irreducible component. Denote by $\Delta_{U_{01}}$ and $\Delta_{U_{21}}$ the row vectors $(n_1 + 1 - a, n_2 + 1 - a, \ldots, n_a + 1 - a)$ and $(n_1 + 1 - n_{a+1}, n_2 + 1 - n_{a+1}, \ldots, n_a + 1 - n_{a+1})$ respectively. With the notation of Lemma 6.2, let $\Delta_{U_1}^{(1)} := \Delta_{U_1}\left(\begin{smallmatrix} i_2, i_3, \ldots, i_\omega \\ \end{smallmatrix}\right)$ and $\Delta_F^{(1)} = (\phi_{ij}) := \Delta_F\left(\begin{smallmatrix} \\ j_2, j_3, \ldots, j_\omega \end{smallmatrix}\right)$. Rearrange the rows of the matrix*

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Delta_{U_{01}} \\ \Delta_{U_1}^{(1)} \\ \Delta_{U_{21}} \end{bmatrix}$$

in such a way that the last column becomes a decreasing sequence of integers, and denote the resulting matrix by $\Delta = (\delta_{ij})$, i.e. $\delta_{1a} \geq \delta_{2a} \geq \cdots \geq \delta_{a+3-\omega\, a}$. Then $\delta_{ia} \geq \phi_{ai}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq a - \omega$.

Proof. Let the notation be as in the proof of Lemma 6.2. The i'_γ-th column of ${}^tU_1''$ is a linear combination of the columns of F over $k[x_3, x_4]$ in which the coefficient of the j_γ-th column of F is a nonzero constant. Hence we may assume that the j_γ-th column of F coincides with the i'_γ-th column of ${}^tU_1''$ for all $2 \leq \gamma \leq \omega$, after a suitable column operations on F if necessary. Let ${U''}_1^{(2)}$ be the $(\omega - 1) \times a$ matrix whose $(\gamma - 1)$-th row is the i'_γ-th row of U_1 for all $2 \leq \gamma \leq \omega$ and $F^{(2)}$ be the $a \times (\omega - 1)$ matrix whose $(\gamma - 1)$-th column is the j_γ-th column of F for all $2 \leq \gamma \leq \omega$. Further, let ${U''}_1^{(1)} := U_1''\left(\begin{smallmatrix} i'_2, i'_3, \ldots, i'_\omega \\ \end{smallmatrix}\right)$ and $F^{(1)} := F\left(\begin{smallmatrix} \\ j_2, j_3, \ldots, j_\omega \end{smallmatrix}\right)$. Note that $\mathit{\Delta}(F^{(1)}) = \Delta_F^{(1)}$, ${}^t{U''}_1^{(2)} = F^{(2)}$, and that $F = (F^{(2)}, F^{(1)})$ (resp. $U_1'' = \left[\begin{smallmatrix} {U''}_1^{(2)} \\ {U''}_1^{(1)} \end{smallmatrix}\right]$) up to permutation of the columns (resp. rows). Let $\mathit{\Theta}$ be the invertible matrix representing a permutation of $\{1, 2, \ldots, a + 3 - \omega\}$ such that

$$\mathit{\Theta}\begin{bmatrix} \Delta_{U_{01}} \\ \Delta_{U_1}^{(1)} \\ \Delta_{U_{21}} \end{bmatrix} = \Delta, \quad \text{and let} \quad V'' := \mathit{\Theta}\begin{bmatrix} U_{01}'' \\ {U''}_1^{(1)} \\ U_{21} \end{bmatrix}, \quad U'' := \begin{bmatrix} {U''}_1^{(2)} \\ V'' \end{bmatrix}.$$

We have V'', $U'' \in \mathrm{MAT}(k[x_3, x_4])$. Moreover, U'' is obtained from

$$\begin{bmatrix} U_{01}'' \\ U_1'' \\ U_{21} \end{bmatrix}$$

by rearranging its rows. Since the i_γ-th row and the i'_γ-th row of Δ_{U_1} are the same, $\varDelta(U''^{(1)}_1) = \Delta^{(1)}_{U_1}$, so that $\varDelta(V'') = \Delta$. Besides, $V''U_4 = 0$, i.e. ${}^tU_4{}^tV'' = 0$, by the relation $\lambda_2\lambda_3 = 0$. Each column of ${}^tV''$ is therefore a linear combination of the columns of F over $k[x_3, x_4]$ by (46), so that each row of V'' is a linear combination of the rows of ${}^tF$ over $k[x_3, x_4]$. Suppose there is a t with $1 \leq t \leq a - \omega$ such that $\delta_{ta} < \phi_{at}$. Then, comparing the degrees, we find that, for every $i \geq t$, the i-th row of V'' is a linear combination over $k[x_3, x_4]$ of the rows of ${}^t\left(F^{(1)}\left({}_{1,2,\ldots,t}\right)\right)$ and ${}^tF^{(2)}$. Moreover, the rows of $U''^{(2)}_1$ are the rows of ${}^tF^{(2)}$. This implies that the rows of U'' are linear combinations over $k[x_3, x_4]$ of the first $t-1$ rows of V'', the $a-\omega-t$ rows of ${}^t\left(F^{(1)}\left({}_{1,2,\ldots,t}\right)\right)$ and of the $\omega - 1$ rows of ${}^tF^{(2)}$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{rank}_{R/(g_1,g_2)}&\left(\begin{bmatrix}U_{01}\\ U_1\\ U_{21}\end{bmatrix} \pmod{(g_1,g_2)}\right)\\ &= \operatorname{rank}_{k[x_3,x_4]}(U'') \leq (t-1) + (a-\omega-t) + (\omega-1) = a-2,\end{aligned}$$

which contradicts Lemma 6.1. Thus $\delta_{ia} \geq \phi_{ai}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq a - \omega$. □

Theorem 6.4. *Assume that $b = 1$, X is contained in an irreducible surface of degree a, and that X does not contain any line as an irreducible component. Let $n'_1, \ldots, n'_\omega$ and i_γ $(1 \leq \gamma \leq \omega)$ be as in Lemma 6.2. Delete the terms $n'_2, \ldots, n'_\omega$ from the sequence $(a, n_1, \ldots, n_a, n_{a+1})$ and then rearrange the remaining terms so that they make a nondecreasing sequence. Let $(n''_1, \ldots, n''_{a+3-\omega})$ denote the resulting sequence. Then*

$$n_{a+1} \leq a - 2 + \sum_{j=1}^{a} n_j - \sum_{\gamma=2}^{\omega} n'_\gamma - \sum_{i=1}^{a-\omega} n''_i.$$

Proof. Let the notation be as in Lemmas 6.2 and 6.3. Denote by $(\xi_{\gamma 1}, \ldots, \xi_{\gamma a})$ the i_γ-th row of Δ_{U_1} for each $2 \leq \gamma \leq \omega$. Then, we have an exact sequence of the form

$$0 \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{j=1}^{a-1} k[x_3, x_4](-q'_j) \xrightarrow{(F^{(2)}, F^{(1)})} \bigoplus_{i=1}^{a} k[x_3, x_4](-p_i) \xrightarrow{{}^tU_4} \mathfrak{a} \longrightarrow 0$$

by (46), where $(q'_1, \ldots, q'_{a-1}) = (q_1, \ldots, q_{a-1})$ up to permutation. Let $\Delta^{(2)}_{U_1}$ (resp. $\Delta^{(2)}_F$) be the $(\omega-1) \times a$ (resp. $a \times (\omega - 1)$) matrix whose $(\gamma-1)$-th row (resp. column) is the i_γ-th row (resp. j_γ-th column) of Δ_{U_1} (resp. Δ_F) for all $2 \leq \gamma \leq \omega$. Then, $\Delta^{(2)}_F = {}^t\Delta^{(2)}_{U_1}$ by Lemma 6.2, so that

$$\varDelta(F^{(2)}, F^{(1)}) = (\Delta^{(2)}_F, \Delta^{(1)}_F) = \begin{bmatrix}\xi_{21} & \cdots & \xi_{\omega 1} & \phi_{11} & \cdots & \phi_{1\,a-\omega}\\ \vdots & \cdots & \vdots & \vdots & \cdots & \vdots\\ \xi_{2a} & \cdots & \xi_{\omega a} & \phi_{a1} & \cdots & \phi_{a\,a-\omega}\end{bmatrix}.$$

By Hilbert-Burch theorem, the first component of ${}^tU_4$ is the determinant of the $(a-1) \times (a-1)$ matrix $(F^{(2)}, F^{(1)})\left({}^{1}\right)$ up to multiplication by a constant. Comparing the degrees, we see

$$n_{a+1} + 1 - n_1 = p_1 = \sum_{\gamma=2}^{\omega} \xi_{\gamma\gamma} + \sum_{i=1}^{a-\omega} \phi_{\omega+i\,i}. \tag{48}$$

Observe that $\delta_{ia} + p_a = \delta_{ij} + p_j$, $\phi_{ai} + p_a = \phi_{ji} + p_j$ for all $1 \le i \le a - \omega$ and $1 \le j \le a$, so that $\delta_{ij} \ge \phi_{ji}$ by Lemma 6.3. With the use of this inequality, we find by (48) that

$$n_{a+1} + 1 - n_1 \le \sum_{\gamma=2}^{\omega} \xi_{\gamma\gamma} + \sum_{i=1}^{a-\omega} \delta_{i\,\omega+i}.$$

Since the components of $\Delta_{U_{01}}$, $\Delta_{U_{21}}$ and Δ_{U_1} are as stated in Lemmas 6.2 and 6.3, we see that $\xi_{\gamma j} = n_j + 1 - n_{i_\gamma} = n_j + 1 - n'_\gamma$, $\delta_{ij} = n_j + 1 - n''_i$ for all γ, i, j. Putting them into the above inequality, we get our assertion. ☐

Remark 6.5. (i) One needs rearrangements as stated in the above theorem only in case $n_{a+1} < n_i$ for some $1 \le i \le a$.

(ii) In section 4 of the paper [1], the case $U_{21} = 0$ is treated in detail. Since we do not assume it in this section, the results loco citato are somewhat different from those given here.

§7. Comparison of our results with Cook's assertions by numerical computations with the help of a computer

Let X be a curve in $\mathbf{P}^3$ and I the saturated homogeneous ideal of X in R. Assume that $\mathrm{char}(k) = 0$. Let ρ be an arbitrary nonnegative integer. With the notation of Remark 1.1, we consider the strongly Borel fixed monomial ideal in $k[x_1, x_2]$ generated by

$$\{\ x_1^a, x_1^{a-1}x_2^{\beta_{a-1}}, \ldots, x_1x_2^{\beta_1}, x_2^{\beta_0}\ \} \cup \{\ x_1^{t_l}x_2^{u_l} \mid 1 \le l \le b,\ \beta_{t_l u_l} \le \rho\ \}, \tag{49}$$

and let $x_1^{s_\rho}, x_1^{s_\rho-1}x_2^{\mu_{s_\rho-1}(\rho)}, \ldots, x_1x_2^{\mu_1(\rho)}, x_2^{\mu_0(\rho)}$ $(1 \le \mu_{s_\rho-1}(\rho) < \mu_{s_\rho-2}(\rho) < \cdots < \mu_0(\rho))$ be its minimal generators, where the linear forms x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 are chosen sufficiently generally. Put $\nu_l(\rho) := \deg(x_1^{s_\rho-l}x_2^{\mu_{s_\rho-l}(\rho)}) = s_\rho - l + \mu_{s_\rho-l}(\rho)$ for $1 \le l \le s_\rho$. We have $\nu_l(\rho) \le \nu_{l+1}(\rho)$ for all $1 \le l < s_\rho$ and $s_\rho \le \nu_1(\rho)$. Now assume further that X is integral. With our notation, the assertions in the main theorem of [11] can be formulated in the following manner:

(i) $\nu_l(\rho) \le \nu_{l+1}(\rho) \le \nu_l(\rho) + 1$ for all $1 \le l < s_\rho$,

(ii) if further $s_\rho < a$, then $s_\rho \le \nu_1(\rho) \le s_\rho + 1$.

Unfortunately, there is an error in the proof of the above assertions (see [12, Section 4]). In [9], however, a proof of (i) is given for a special case.

Theorem 7.1 ([9, Theorem 5]). *With the notation above, the assertion* (i) *is true for all ρ such that $s_\rho = s_0$.*

Let $d(X)$ and $g(X)$ denote the degree and the arithmetic genus of X respectively, and let $(a; n_1, \dots, n_a; n_{a+1}, \dots, n_{a+b})$ be the basic sequence of I. Since

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - g(X) + \nu d(X) &= \dim_k([R/I]_\nu) = \dim_k([R]_\nu) - \dim_k([I]_\nu) \\ &= \binom{\nu+3}{3} - \binom{\nu-a+3}{3} - \sum_{l=1}^{a} \binom{\nu - n_l + 2}{2} - \sum_{l=1}^{b} \binom{\nu - n_{a+l} + 1}{1} \end{aligned}$$

for all $\nu \gg 0$, direct computation shows that

$$d(X) = \sum_{l=1}^{a} n_l - \frac{1}{2}a(a-1) - b,$$

$$g(X) = 1 + \sum_{l=1}^{a} \frac{1}{2} n_l(n_l - 3) - \sum_{l=1}^{b} n_{a+l} + b - \frac{1}{6}a(a-1)(a-5)$$

(see [2, Remark 1.9]). We want to consider sequences satisfying these equalities.

Let (d, g) be a pair of positive integer d and a nonnegative integer g, and $Bseq = (a; n_1, \dots, n_a; n_{a+1}, \dots, n_{a+b})$ be a sequence of integers such that

$$\begin{gathered} 0 < a \le n_1 \le \cdots \le n_a,\ n_1 \le n_{a+1} \le \cdots \le n_{a+b},\ b \ge 0, \\ a \le d-1,\ n_l \le d-1\ (1 \le l \le a+b),\ d = D(Bseq),\ g = G(Bseq). \end{gathered} \tag{50}$$

See Introduction for the definitions of $D(Bseq)$ and $G(Bseq)$. When $Bseq = B_R(I)$, we have $d(X) = D(B_R(I))$ and $g(X) = G(B_R(I))$ by the above formulas. Moreover, $a \le d(X) - 1$ and $n_l \le d(X) - 1$ for all $1 \le l \le a + b$ by Castelnuovo's regularity theorem combined with the results of [10]. Hence $B_R(I)$ satisfies (50). Moreover the generic initial ideal $\mathrm{in}^x(I)$ is strongly Borel fixed by [15]. With this in mind, we shall say that a sequence *Bseq* satisfies A-conditions for (d, g), if there is a strongly Borel fixed monomial ideal in $k[x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4]$ giving the sequence *Bseq* as in Remark 1.1, and if *Bseq* satisfies (50) and all the numerical conditions described in Lemma 2.4, Theorem 5.7, Corollary 5.8, Propositions 5.11, 5.12, and Theorem 6.4. Likewise, we shall say that *Bseq* satisfies C-conditions for (d, g), if *Bseq* satisfies (50) and is given by a strongly Borel fixed monomial ideal which fulfills Cook's assertions (i) and (ii). We can find all the sequences *Bseq* satisfying A-conditions and C-conditions respectively with the help of a computer. We can find the sequences satisfying both conditions, too.

Since there are only a finite number of possibilities of a, b, n_l $(1 \le l \le a+b)$ with the property (50) for a fixed (d, g), one can extract from them all *Bseq*'s satisfying the numerical conditions described in the lemma, the propositions, the theorems and the corollary mentioned just above, carrying out simple numerical testings.

In order to get the generators of strongly Borel fixed monomial ideals with a given *Bseq*, we need some more knowledge of the structure of such ideals. Assume that $Bseq = (a; n_1, \dots, n_a; n_{a+1}, \dots, n_{a+b})$ satisfies (50). Let β_l $(0 \le l \le a-1)$, $t_l, u_l, \beta_{t_l u_l}$ $(1 \le l \le b)$ be integers such that $n_l = a - l + \beta_{a-l}$ $(1 \le l \le a)$, $n_{a+l} = t_l + u_l + \beta_{t_l u_l}$ $(1 \le l \le b)$, $1 \le \beta_{a-1} < \beta_{a-2} < \cdots < \beta_0$, $t_l < a$, $u_l < \beta_{t_l}$, $\beta_{t_l u_l} > 0$ for $1 \le l \le b$, and $(t_l, u_l) \neq$

$(t_{l'}, u_{l'})$ for l, l' with $l \neq l'$. As explained in Remark 1.1, we can treat our problem in this setting. Let

$$J := Rx_1^a + \sum_{l=1}^{a} k[x_2, x_3, x_4]x_1^{a-l}x_2^{\beta_{a-l}} + \sum_{l=1}^{b} k[x_3, x_4]x_1^{t_l}x_2^{u_l}x_3^{\beta_{t_l u_l}}.$$

The right hand side is a $k[x_3, x_4]$-submodule of R and in fact the sum is direct over $k[x_3, x_4]$. Notice that J is a strongly Borel fixed monomial ideal in R if and only if so is $J \cap k[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ in $k[x_1, x_2, x_3]$. For nonnegative integers n and γ with $n \geq \gamma$, let

$$\varepsilon(n, \gamma) := \max\{\ u \mid 0 \leq u \leq n - \gamma \text{ and } x_1^{n-\gamma-u}x_2^{u}x_3^{\gamma} \in [J]_n\ \},$$

where $[J]_n$ denotes as usual the subsets of J consisting of homogeneous elements of degree n. In case the set on the right hand side is empty, we put $\varepsilon(n, \gamma) := -\infty$ for convenience sake. It is easy to verify that J is a strongly Borel fixed monomial ideal in R if and only if

$$x_1^{n-\gamma-u}x_2^{u}x_3^{\gamma} \in [J]_n \text{ for all } u, n, \gamma \text{ with } 0 \leq u \leq \varepsilon(n, \gamma),\ 0 \leq \gamma \leq n, \text{ and} \tag{51}$$

$$\varepsilon(n-1, \gamma-1) \leq \varepsilon(n, \gamma) \leq \varepsilon(n, \gamma-1) - 1 \text{ for all } n, \gamma \text{ with } 1 \leq \gamma \leq n. \tag{52}$$

Rewriting the first one of the above conditions in terms of the integers $t_l, u_l, \beta_{t_l u_l}$ $(1 \leq l \leq b)$, we obtain the following necessary and sufficient condition for J to be a strongly Borel fixed ideal.

Lemma 7.2. *The set J is a strongly Borel fixed monomial ideal in R if and only if the condition* (52) *holds and*

$$\begin{aligned} &\{\ (t_l, u_l, \beta_{t_l u_l}) \mid n_{a+l} = n \textit{ and } \beta_{t_l u_l} = \gamma\ (1 \leq l \leq b)\} \\ &\qquad = \{\ (n-\gamma-u, u, \gamma) \mid u \geq 0 \textit{ and } \varepsilon(n-1, \gamma-1) + 1 \leq u \leq \varepsilon(n, \gamma)\} \end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

for all n, γ with $n \geq 1,\ 1 \leq \gamma \leq n$.

Proof. Let $J' := Rx_1^a + \sum_{l=1}^{a} k[x_2, x_3, x_4]x_1^{a-l}x_2^{\beta_{a-l}}$ and $J'' := \sum_{l=1}^{b} k[x_3, x_4]x_1^{t_l}x_2^{u_l}x_3^{\beta_{t_l u_l}}$. Then J' is a strongly Borel fixed monomial ideal in R. We have

$$\begin{aligned} [J]_n &= [J']_n \oplus (kx_3 + kx_4)\,[J'']_{n-1} \oplus \bigoplus_{1 \leq l \leq b,\ n_{a+l} = n} kx_1^{t_l}x_2^{u_l}x_3^{\beta_{t_l u_l}}, \\ [J]_{n-1} &= [J']_{n-1} \oplus [J'']_{n-1} \end{aligned}$$

over k. Assuming that J is a strongly Borel fixed monomial ideal, we show (53). When $n < a$, both sides of (53) are empty. Suppose that $n \geq a$ and that $\gamma \geq 1$. Let $x_1^{n-\gamma-u}x_2^{u}x_3^{\gamma}$ be an element of $[J']_n \oplus (kx_3 + kx_4)\,[J'']_{n-1}$. Then it lies in $x_3\,[J]_{n-1}$, since $[J'']_{n-1} \subset [J]_{n-1}$ and $[J']_n \cap k[x_1, x_2, x_3]x_3 \subset x_3\,[J']_{n-1}$. Namely, $x_1^{n-\gamma-u}x_2^{u}x_3^{\gamma-1}$ lies in $[J]_{n-1}$, so that $u \leq \varepsilon(n-1, \gamma-1)$. Besides, $x_1^{n-\gamma-\varepsilon(n-1,\gamma-1)}x_2^{\varepsilon(n-1,\gamma-1)}x_3^{\gamma} = x_3(x_1^{n-\gamma-\varepsilon(n-1,\gamma-1)}x_2^{\varepsilon(n-1,\gamma-1)}x_3^{\gamma-1}) \in x_3\,[J]_{n-1}$ in this case. Hence $\max\{\ u \mid 0 \leq u \leq n-\gamma \text{ and } x_1^{n-\gamma-u}x_2^{u}x_3^{\gamma} \in [J']_n \oplus (kx_3+kx_4)\,[J'']_{n-1}\ \} = \varepsilon(n-1, \gamma-1)$ unless $\varepsilon(n-1, \gamma-1) \neq$

$-\infty$. The right hand side of (53) therefore coincides with the left hand side by (51). Conversely, assuming that both (52) and (53) hold, we show (51) by induction on n. The case $n < a$ is trivial. Suppose that $n \geq a$ and that (51) is true for smaller values of n. When $\gamma = 0$, we see $x_1^{n-u}x_2^u \in [J']_n$ for all $0 \leq u \leq \varepsilon(n,0)$ since J' is a strongly Borel fixed monomial ideal. Let γ be an integer with $1 \leq \gamma \leq n$. It is enough to consider the case where $\varepsilon(n,\gamma) \geq 0$. If $\varepsilon(n-1,\gamma-1) = -\infty$, then $x_1^{n-\gamma-u}x_2^u x_3^\gamma \in [J]_n$ for all $0 \leq u \leq \varepsilon(n,\gamma)$ by (53). Otherwise, $x_1^{n-\gamma-u}x_2^u x_3^{\gamma-1} \in [J]_{n-1}$ for all $0 \leq u \leq \varepsilon(n-1,\gamma-1)$ by the induction hypothesis, which implies that $x_1^{n-\gamma-u}x_2^u x_3^\gamma \in [J]_n$ for all such u. Hence we see (51) by (53). □

Assume that (51) – (53) are valid. Let $\delta(n,\gamma) := \max\{-1, \varepsilon(n,\gamma)\} - \max\{-1, \varepsilon(n-1,\gamma-1)\}$ for $1 \leq \gamma \leq n$ and $\chi(n) := \#\{\ l \mid n_{a+l} = n,\ 1 \leq l \leq b\ \}$ for $n \geq 0$. Then $\delta(n,\gamma) = \{\ (t_l, u_l, \beta_{t_l u_l}) \mid n_{a+l} = n \text{ and } \beta_{t_l u_l} = \gamma\ (1 \leq l \leq b)\ \}$ by (53). One sees

$$\sum_{\gamma=1}^{n} \delta(n,\gamma) = \chi(n), \tag{54}$$

$$\varepsilon(n,\gamma) = \varepsilon(n-1,\gamma-1) \text{ if } \delta(n,\gamma) = 0, \text{and} \tag{55}$$

$$\varepsilon(n,\gamma) = \delta(n,\gamma) + \max\{-1, \varepsilon(n-1,\gamma-1)\} \text{ if } \delta(n,\gamma) > 0. \tag{56}$$

In particular, $\varepsilon(n,\gamma) = \varepsilon(n-1,\gamma-1)$ for all $1 \leq \gamma \leq n$ such that $\chi(n) = 0$. Moreover, the $\varepsilon(n,0)$ $(n \geq 0)$ are completely determined by J' and are nonnegative for $n \geq a$.

Given *Bseq* satisfying (50), the β_{a-l} can be obtained by the simple formula $n_l = a - l + \beta_{a-l}$ for all $1 \leq l \leq a$. The above observation indicates that we can find $t_l, u_l, \beta_{t_l u_l}$ $(1 \leq l \leq b)$ with the help of a computer in the following manner.

(i) Find all possible nonnegative integers $\delta(n,\gamma)$ with $1 \leq \gamma \leq n$ satisfying (54) for all $n \geq 1$. In fact, we have only to consider the finite cases where $\chi(n) > 0$. We put $\delta(n,\gamma) = 0$ for all $1 \leq \gamma \leq n$ with $\chi(n) = 0$.

(ii) Define $\varepsilon(n,\gamma)$ by (55) and (56) for all $0 \leq \gamma \leq n$ inductively on γ, starting with $\varepsilon(n,0)$ $(n \geq 0)$.

(iii) Check if $\varepsilon(n,\gamma)$ satisfies (52) for all $1 \leq \gamma \leq n \leq n_{a+b}$.

(iv) Define $t_l, u_l, \beta_{t_l u_l}$ $(1 \leq l \leq b)$ by (53).

Since $\varepsilon(n,\gamma) = \varepsilon(n-1,\gamma-1)$ for all n, γ with $1 \leq \gamma \leq n,\ n > n_{a+b}$ by our constructions (i) and (ii), it is enogh to check if $\varepsilon(n,\gamma)$ sagisfies (52) only for $1 \leq \gamma \leq n \leq n_{a+b}$. Once the integers β_l $(0 \leq l \leq a-1)$, $t_l, u_l, \beta_{t_l u_l}$ $(1 \leq l \leq b)$ are obtained, it is an easy matter to verify if J stisfies Cook's assertions (i) and (ii).

The programs we have used to find all *Bseq*'s satisfying A- or C-conditions are written in C in which only numerical computations of integers are carried out. The sequences we get by this program do not necessarily correspond to integral curves in $\mathbf{P}^3$.

At present, the numbers of the outputs seem too big. That is, we are far from the answer to the problem stated in Introduction. The tables below help us to see how A-conditions and C-conditions differ from each other.

Tables 1 and 2 show the numbers of the basic sequences which satisfy A-conditions or C-conditions or both. If g is close to the upper bound $1 + d(d-3)/6$ of the genus of a nonsingular irreducible curve in $\mathbf{P}^3$ not contained in any quadric surfaces (see [14, Introduction]), A-conditions seem stronger than C-conditions. In general, however, both of the implications "A-conditions ⇒ C-conditions"and "C-conditions ⇒ A-conditions" are false.

Table 3 shows the basic sequences with $(d, g) = (10, 9)$ that satisfy C-conditions and the corresponding Borel fixed monomial ideals, where a triplet (s, t, u) indicates the monomial $x_1^s x_2^t x_3^u$. Among them, only the four sequences

$$(3; 4, 5, 5; 7),\ (3; 5, 5, 5; 5, 6),\ (4; 4, 4, 4, 5; 6),\ (4; 4, 4, 5, 5; 5, 5)$$

satisfy A-conditions. Other ones are ruled out by Proposition 5.11 and Corollary 5.8.

Table 1: Numbers of outputs

(d,g)	C	A	both
(3,0)	1	1	1
(4,0)	1	1	1
(5,0)	3	2	2
(6,0)	4	3	3
(7,0)	9	6	6
(8,0)	20	13	12
(9,0)	48	28	27
(10,0)	111	69	68
(11,0)	250	142	137
(12,0)	570	348	311
(13,0)	1380	804	731

Table 2: Numbers of outputs

(d,g)	C	A	both
(26,100)	1	1	1
(26,99)	2	1	1
(26,98)	3	1	1
(26,97)	5	2	2
(26,96)	6	3	3
(27,109)	1	1	1
(27,108)	2	1	1
(27,107)	2	1	1
(27,106)	3	2	2
(27,105)	4	3	3
(28,117)	1	1	1
(28,116)	1	1	1
(28,115)	3	2	2
(28,114)	4	2	2
(28,113)	5	3	3
(29,126)	2	2	2
(29,125)	2	1	1
(29,124)	3	1	1
(29,123)	5	2	2
(29,122)	6	3	3
(30,136)	1	1	1
(30,135)	2	1	1
(30,134)	2	1	1
(30,133)	3	2	2
(30,132)	5	4	4

Table 3: C-conditions for $(d,g) = (10,9)$

Borel fixed monomial ideals	Basic sequences
(3,0,0) (2,2,0)(1,4,0)(0,5,0) (1,3,3)	(3;4,5,5;7)
(3,0,0) (2,2,0)(1,4,0)(0,6,0) (0,5,1)(1,3,2)	(3;4,5,6;6,6)
(3,0,0) (2,3,0)(1,4,0)(0,5,0) (2,2,1)(1,3,2)	(3;5,5,5;5,6)
(3,0,0) (2,3,0)(1,4,0)(0,6,0) (2,2,1)(1,3,1)(0,5,1)	(3;5,5,6;5,5,6)
(4,0,0) (3,1,0)(2,2,0)(1,3,0)(0,5,0) (0,4,2)	(4;4,4,4,5;6)
(4,0,0) (3,1,0)(2,2,0)(1,3,0)(0,5,0) (3,0,3)	
(4,0,0) (3,1,0)(2,2,0)(1,4,0)(0,5,0) (3,0,1)(1,3,2)	(4;4,4,5,5;4,6)
(4,0,0) (3,1,0)(2,2,0)(1,4,0)(0,5,0) (1,3,1)(0,4,1)	(4;4,4,5,5;5,5)
(4,0,0) (3,1,0)(2,2,0)(1,4,0)(0,5,0) (1,3,1)(3,0,2)	
(4,0,0) (3,1,0)(2,2,0)(1,4,0)(0,6,0) (3,0,1)(1,3,1)(0,5,1)	(4;4,4,5,6;4,5,6)
(4,0,0) (3,1,0)(2,3,0)(1,4,0)(0,5,0) (3,0,1)(2,2,1)(1,3,1)	(4;4,5,5,5;4,5,5)

References

[1] M. Amasaki, *Preparatory structure theorem for ideals defining space curves*, Publ. RIMS, Kyoto Univ. **19** (1983), 493 – 518.

[2] M. Amasaki, *On the structure of arithmetically Buchsbaum curves in* $\mathbf{P}^3_k$, Publ. RIMS, Kyoto Univ. **20** (1984), 793 – 837.

[3] M. Amasaki, *Examples of nonsingular irreducible curves which give reducible singular points of* $\mathrm{red}(\mathrm{H}_{d,g})$, Publ. RIMS, Kyoto Univ. **21** (1985), 761 – 786.

[4] M. Amasaki, *Curves in* $\mathbf{P}^3$ *whose ideals are simple in a certain numerical sense*, Publ. RIMS, Kyoto Univ. **23** (1987), 1017 – 1052.

[5] M. Amasaki, *Integral arithmetically Buchsbaum curves in* $\mathbf{P}^3$, J. Math. Soc. Japan **41**, No. 1 (1989), 1 – 8.

[6] M. Amasaki, *Application of the generalized Weierstrass preparation theorem to the study of homogeneous ideals*, Trans. AMS **317** (1990), 1 – 43.

[7] M. Amasaki, *Generators of graded modules associated with linear filter-regular sequences*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **114** (1996), 1 – 23.

[8] M. Amasaki, *Generic Gröbner bases and Weierstrass bases of homogeneous submodules of graded free modules*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **152** (2000), 3 – 16.

[9] M. Amasaki, *Verification of the connectedness of space curve invariants for a special case*, Comm. Alg. **32**, No. 10 (2004), 3739 – 3744.

[10] D. Bayer and M. Stillman, *A criterion for detecting m-regularity*, Invent. math. **87** (1987), 1 – 11.

[11] M. Cook, *The connectedness of space curves invariants*, Compositio Math. **111** (1998), 221 – 244.

[12] W. Decker and F.-O. Schreyer, *Non-general type surfaces in* $\mathbf{P}^4$*: Some remarks on bounds and constructions*, J. Symb. Comp. **29** (2000), 545 – 583.

[13] L. Gruson et C. Peskine, *Genre des courbes de l'éspace projectif*, in "Algebraic Geometry", Lecture Notes in Math. **687**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin · Heidelberg · New York, 1978, pp. 31 – 59.

[14] L. Gruson et C. Peskine, *Genre des courbes de l'éspace projectif (II)*, Ann. scient. Ec. Norm. Sup., 4^{e} sèrie, **15** (1982), 401 – 418.

[15] T. Urabe, *On Hironaka's Monoideal*, Publ. RIMS, Kyoto Univ. **15** (1979), 279 – 287.